

Daniel and Revelation Committee Series

Volume 5

Doctrine of the Sanctuary
A Historical Survey
(1845–1863)

Editor
Frank B. Holbrook

Biblical Research Institute
General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists
Silver Spring, MD 20904

Copyright © 1989 by the
Biblical Research Institute
12501 Old Columbia Pike
Silver Spring, MD 20904

The authors assume full responsibility for the accuracy of all quotations cited in this book.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Doctrine of the Sanctuary.

(Daniel and Revelation Committee series; v. 5)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Sanctuary doctrine (Seventh-Day Adventists)—History of doctrines—19th century. 2. Seventh-Day Adventists—Doctrines—History—19th century. 3. Adventists—Doctrines—History—19th century. I. Holbrook, Frank B. II. Series

BX6154.D53 1989 230'.6732 88-63905

ISBN 0-925675-04-0 (Volume 5)

ISBN 0-925675-03-2 (7 Volume Set)

Contents

To the Reader

I. Historical Background (Early Nineteenth Century)

P. Gerard Damsteegt

II. Among Sabbatarian Adventists (1845–1850)

P. Gerard Damsteegt

Early Expositions

An Expanding Doctrinal System

III. Continued Clarification (1850–1863)

P. Gerard Damsteegt

Sanctuary Polemics

Christ's Second Apartment Ministry

Sanctuary and Salvation

IV. The Investigative Judgment: Its Early Development

C. Mervyn Maxwell

Appendices

A. William Miller's Use of the Word "Atonement"

Dalton D. Baldwin

B. Ellen G. White's Use of Scripture to Explain the Sanctuary Doctrine

P. Gerard Damsteegt

C. Challengers to the Doctrine of the Sanctuary

Arnold V. Wallenkampf

D. Statement on the Desmond Ford Document

Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980

E. Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary (Consensus Document)

Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980

Index

To the Reader

In 1888 Ellen White wrote, “The subject of the sanctuary was the key which unlocked the mystery of the disappointment of 1844. It opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious, showing that God’s hand had directed the great advent movement and revealing present duty as it brought to light the position and work of His people” (*The Great Controversy*, 1888 ed., p. 423).

Since this central truth came to our people through an extended process of study and clarification over a period of several years, the Committee agreed that one volume of its series should treat the historical development of the sanctuary doctrine. This would enable the present membership to look over the shoulders of the pioneers, as it were, and to evaluate for themselves the reasoning and the biblical support that the pioneers found for the doctrine.

The published doctoral studies by Dr. P. Gerard Damsteegt in this area (*Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* [Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977]) especially qualified him to develop this doctrinal picture from the original sources. The results of his research appear in the first three chapters of this volume. A fourth chapter by Dr. C. Mervyn Maxwell adds useful supplementary material (reprinted from *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, eds. Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Lesher [Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1981]).

The term “atonement” has often been a source of misunderstanding in connection with Adventist teaching of the sanctuary doctrine. In Appendix A Dr. Dalton Baldwin explains the origin of this problem. In Appendix B Dr. Damsteegt demonstrates Ellen White’s appeal to Scripture to explain the sanctuary doctrine.

As the Sabbatarian doctrine of the sanctuary developed, it was attacked by those Millerite groups who were drifting from their original positions. Through the years critics, both within and without the church, have recognized the crucial nature of this doctrine to the whole fabric of Adventist belief and have sought to discredit it. Appendix C summarizes the major challengers and their criticisms in an article by Dr. Arnold V. Wallenkampf reprinted from the above mentioned BRI volume.

Finally, we have appended two documents issued by the Sanctuary Review Committee, a body of 114 persons representing the world divisions of the church, which, meeting in 1980 at Glacier View, Colorado, reviewed the doctrine in the light of recent charges and reaffirmed its validity. Thus the history of the early development of the sanctuary doctrine and a history of its criticism, with the church’s response, have been brought together in this present volume for the reader’s convenience.

For a more detailed scriptural treatment of the sanctuary doctrine the reader is referred to the relevant sections in volumes 1–4 of the Daniel and Revelation Committee Series.

The Daniel and Revelation Committee
General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists

Chapter I

Historical Background

(Early Nineteenth Century)

P. Gerard Damsteegt

Editorial Synopsis. Two prominent methods of prophetic interpretation—historicism and preterism, with roots reaching back to the Reformation era—affected Christian interpretation of [Daniel 8:14](#) in the early nineteenth century.

Since preterism identified the little horn ([Dan 8](#)) as Antiochus IV Epiphanes (the second century B.C. Syrian persecutor of the Jews), the 2300 evening-mornings were interpreted as 2300 or 1150 literal days of persecution, and the “sanctuary” was construed to be the desecrated Jewish temple.

On the other hand historicist interpreters identified the little horn as either Islam or Rome (pagan/papal) and the time period as 2300 years (on the year-day principle), expected to end between 1843–1847. Those who designated the horn as Islam interpreted the “cleansing of the sanctuary” to include the destruction of Muhammadanism and the liberation of Palestine, the restoration and conversion of the Jews, the breaking of the Muhammadan yoke from Christian countries, the freeing of the church from anti-Christian abominations, and other similar events. Those who perceived the horn as Rome construed the purification of the sanctuary to indicate, among other things, the purging away of papal influences and the cleansing of the church from all its impurities. The event would begin the millennium.

Actually, a wide variety of ideas floated about in the sea of religious thought in addition to these more conspicuous concepts. Some commentators noted the links between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries. Others explored the significance of the Jewish festivals, particularly the Day of Atonement. The typical day was associated with the end of the world, the Second Advent, the resurrection, the judgment, and the beginning of the jubilee.

The preaching and writing of William Miller (1782–1849), beginning in 1831, led to an interconfessional movement in North America that reached its climax in 1843–1844. As a historicist, Miller identified the little horn as Rome (pagan/papal). He interpreted the “sanctuary” as the church that would be purified at Christ’s return. Since he also believed that the earth would be cleansed by fire, it was natural for the church and earth to meld in Millerite preaching on the cleansing of the sanctuary.

Josiah Litch (1809–1886), a prominent Millerite minister, expressed views that eventually would affect Sabbatarian Adventist thought on the doctrine of the sanctuary. For example, Litch believed (contra Miller) that the expression “anoint the Most Holy” ([Dan 9:24](#)) referred to the inauguration of Christ’s priestly ministry in heaven. He also observed that the final judgment had two dimensions: a judicial trial and a penal executive judgment. Since a trial precedes the execution of the judgment, and since (in his understanding) the executive judgment takes place at the general resurrection, it follows that the “trial” must necessarily precede the Second Advent.

In 1843 Miller published an article suggesting that the key to the end of the 2300 years was to be found in the Jewish ceremonial feasts. He noted that the Spring types (Passover, etc.) were fulfilled in connection with Christ’s first advent. The fall feasts could find their fulfillment only in connection with Christ’s second advent. Samuel S. Snow (1806–1870), another Millerite minister, refined this suggestion. Building on the corrected computation that the full 2300 years would end in the fall of 1844 rather than its spring, Snow argued that the typical Day of Atonement would be the actual day of Christ’s return.

According to the Karaite Jewish reckoning, based on the Mosaic method of calculation, the typical Day of Atonement fell on October 22 in 1844. The preaching of this specific time created an enormous fervor throughout the Millerite ranks. It was referred to as “the seventh-month movement” (the fall festivals, including the Day of Atonement, came in the seventh month of the Jewish calendar).

While the Millerites on the one hand saw the church/earth as the sanctuary that would be cleansed at Christ’s second advent, they also were aware that He ministered in behalf of humankind as a high priest in the heavenly realities (Most Holy Place). His death was viewed as a sacrifice, but His priestly intercession was viewed as His making atonement for repenting sinners. Their interpretation of the parable of the ten virgins ([Matt 25](#)) and the belief that Christ would close His priestly mediation for the world at the end of the 2300 years contributed in part to their confusion when the Saviour failed to return as they so ardently hoped and expected.

Section Outline

- I. General Christian Teaching
- II. Concepts Within the Millerite Movement

General Christian Teaching

The Seventh-day Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary must be understood against the background of nineteenth century expositors who interpreted [Daniel 8](#) and its topic of the “sanctuary.” They focused on the identifying of the little horn symbol and the duration of the prophetic time period. Naturally the identity of the horn colored the subsequent interpretation of the sanctuary and its cleansing.

Sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#)

Near the beginning of the nineteenth century two distinct interpretations of [Daniel 8](#) circulated among Christians. The first interpreted the little horn as Antiochus IV Epiphanes, second century B.C. persecutor of the Jews. The “2300 evenings and mornings” were seen as the persecution period of either 2300 or 1150 literal days. The sanctuary ([Dan 8:14](#)), therefore, was understood to be the desecrated Jewish temple in Jerusalem.¹

The second approach viewed [Daniel 8](#) as symbolic of the history of God’s people from Daniel’s day until the present.² It made use of the “year-day” principle employed by interpreters for many centuries.³ This principle held that a prophetic day stood symbolically for a literal solar year. Biblical evidence for this approach was found in [Numbers 14:34](#); [Ezekiel 4:6](#), and [Daniel 9:24–27](#).⁴ The termination of the 2300 evening-mornings—interpreted as 2,300 years—was placed between 1843 and 1847.⁵ The little horn, therefore, could not be Antiochus. Rather, interpreters identified it as either Muhammadanism (Islam) or Rome. The Antiochus interpretation was rejected as hermeneutically unsound and historically incorrect.⁶

The identity of the little horn as Muhammadanism prevailed in Europe. It also affected the thinking of various writers in America. As a result these commentators identified the sanctuary with Palestine, Jerusalem, or its temple.⁷ The cleansing of the sanctuary was expected to involve the fall or destruction of Muhammadanism,⁸ resulting in events such as the liberation of Palestine,⁹ the cleansing of the city of Jerusalem for the second advent,¹⁰ the restoration of Judah,¹¹ the restoration or reestablishment of the Jews in Palestine¹² and their conversion.¹³ Some who identified the sanctuary as the church felt that its purification meant the cleansing of Christian countries from the Muhammadan yoke,¹⁴ the freeing of the church from anti-Christian abominations,¹⁵ or the restoration of true worship in Jerusalem.¹⁶

The view that identified Rome (pagan and papal) as the little horn led to a general perception of the sanctuary as the church. Consequently the cleansing of the sanctuary was construed to be the cleansing of the church from all its impurity,¹⁷ the purification of the ministry,¹⁸ the reestablishment of the true worship of God,¹⁹ the purging away of papal influences,²⁰ or the removal of anti-Christian defilements.²¹ These events linked with the beginning of the millennium²² and were expected to involve God’s judgments.²³

Various commentators felt that before the church could meet its Lord, it had to be prepared through a purifying process. The teachings of the Christian church, as well as its peoples, needed purification so that all could be presented without spot or wrinkle.²⁴ Therefore, the glorious state could not be attained until the Lord would come to His temple ([Mal 3:1](#)),²⁵ would purify the sons of Levi ([Mal 3:2–3](#)),²⁶ and the seven plagues would fall ([Rev 15](#)).²⁷

Sanctuary Service and the Second Advent

Several interpreters pointed out that the OT sanctuary service had important applications for their day. The earthly sanctuary in Hebrews was considered a type of the heavenly sanctuary.²⁸ One author stated that “the typical significance of the Levitical ceremonial” gives us “a key” to “the heavenly service.”²⁹ Another referred to the Holy of Holies as a symbol of heaven and the future glorious state of the church on earth.³⁰

The yearly sanctuary festivals were studied with interest. One interpreter felt that the autumn festivals of the Day of Atonement and Feast of Tabernacles had special relevance for the remnant church of [Revelation 12:17](#).³¹ Another saw a close relationship between the Feast of Trumpets, the Day of Atonement, and Jubilee, for it was the Jubilee—a type of the millennium—that began on the Day of Atonement which in turn was ushered in by the Feast of Trumpets.³²

The Day of Atonement, therefore, was closely associated with the end of the world and the Second Advent.³³ Some saw in the Day of Atonement a type of the final judgment.³⁴ In this context the high priest coming out of the Holy of Holies ([Heb 9:28](#)) represented Christ coming to judge the disobedient³⁵ and to gather in the sealed ones.³⁶ One author said, “the day of atonement does not prefigure Christ’s atonement, for the passover did that, but the day of vengeance, [Isa. 63:4](#).³⁷ Another wrote that “of the Jewish feasts and fasts, the atonement is that which especially concerns us, it being the time when Christ shall come forth from within the veil, [Heb. 6:20](#); when the dead saints shall be raised, the living changed, and the jubilee begin.”³⁸

The text of [Revelation 11:19](#), picturing the opening of God’s temple in heaven and revealing the ark, was seen by some as a reference to the Day of Atonement. According to one author the text meant “the opening of the veil in the day of atonement,”³⁹ indicating that “this period is therefore our day of atonement and requires our particular notice, to know what events we may expect answering to the type.”⁴⁰

In this religious climate the Second Advent or Millerite movement emerged in North America.

Concepts Within the Millerite Movement

In America William Miller (1782–1849) ministered as the principal exponent of the imminent Second Advent. His biblical prophetic preaching gained him numerous followers, popularly called Millerites. This interconfessional movement swelled into a crusade that reached its climax during the years 1843 and 1844. First, we will look at the general position Miller and his associates originally held. Then we will consider the developments that occurred as they continued their studies and preaching.

General Sanctuary Views

The Millerites, like many others, adhered to the historicist hermeneutical tradition which designated the little horn of [Daniel 8](#) as pagan and papal Rome.

Miller viewed [Daniel 8](#) as a parallel prophecy to [Daniel 2](#) and [7](#). Its different symbolism complemented the previous visions. He identified the ram and goat as “the kings of Media and Persia” and the “king of Grecia.” The goat’s great horn symbolized Alexander the Great ([8:21](#)). And its breaking and replacement by four other horns he interpreted as Alexander’s death and the subsequent division of the empire into four parts by his principal generals. The little horn itself, generally interpreted as originating from one of the four horns,⁴¹ he identified as a persecuting power of God’s people. The persecution period covered two phases—the reign of pagan as well as papal Rome—with its termination at the Second Advent.

The first persecuting phase of the little horn Miller saw pictured in [8:9–11](#). After having captured Macedonia—one of the divisions of the Greek empire—Rome extended itself toward the south, the east, and the pleasant land, Palestine. [Daniel 8:10–11](#) revealed the struggle between the Jews and the Romans.

The specific actions of the horn would be against “the prince of the host,” “the daily sacrifice,” and “the place of his sanctuary.” He interpreted these as the actions of the Roman empire which “would magnify itself even against Christ the prince of His people, and be the instrument of destroying the Jewish ceremonial law, and finally Jerusalem itself, the place of Christ’s sanctuary.”⁴²

In [Daniel 8:12](#) Miller saw the second persecuting phase as identical to the persecution under the little horn of [Daniel 7](#). [Verse 12](#), he said, signified “the Papal power or the abomination that maketh desolate, by reason of departing from the truth and leading off an host with them; they cast out and trampled on the true followers of Christ, and practiced and prospered in their iniquity.”⁴³

Because of the pagan and papal dimensions of the little horn, Miller could not interpret the sanctuary in [verse 14](#) as the Jewish sanctuary in Jerusalem, for such a view had no relevance for the horn’s papal aspect. Therefore, he viewed the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#), which was to be “cleansed” or “justified,” as the church, “the people of God in all the world and among all nations.”⁴⁴

Some time later Miller referred the “daily sacrifice” of [8:13](#) to “the completion of the typical priesthood, or seventy weeks.” The “transgression of desolation” was identified with “the sufferings of the people of God, under the abominations of the fourth kingdom, both pagan and papal, when they should be trodden underfoot, until Christ should be revealed in his glory.”⁴⁵

In the same text ([8:13](#)) the “sanctuary” was seen as the “temple at Jerusalem and those who worship therein, which was trodden under foot by the Pagan kingdoms of the world, since the days of Daniel.” In reference to the papal persecution the “host” was identified in the light of [Revelation 11:2–3](#) as “the people who worship in the outer court, and fitly represents the Christian church.”⁴⁶

The sanctuary of [8:14](#) Miller interpreted as “the true sanctuary which God has built of lively stones to His own acceptance, through Christ, of which the temple at Jerusalem was but a type.”⁴⁷ As to its cleansing or justification, he stated that “when that new Jerusalem is perfected, then shall we be cleansed and justified,” but “the spiritual sanctuary will not be cleansed until Christ’s second coming, and then all Israel shall be raised, judged, and justified in His sight.”⁴⁸ Separate from this cleansing of the sanctuary, he distinguished a cleansing of the earth by fire when Christ returns.⁴⁹

In his most extensive exposition of the sanctuary, published in 1842, Miller indicated that the word “sanctuary” could mean:

1. Jesus Christ ([Isa 8:14](#); [Ezek 11:16](#)).
2. Heaven ([Ps 102:12](#); [20:2](#)).
3. Judah ([Ps 114:2](#)).
4. The temple of Jerusalem ([1 Chr 22:19](#); [Exod 25:8](#)).
5. The Holy of Holies ([1 Chr 28:10](#); [Lev 4:6](#)).
6. The earth ([Isa 60:13](#); [1 Kgs 8:27](#); [Rev 5:10](#), [20:6](#); [Matt 6:20](#); [Ps 82:8](#); [96:6–13](#); [Rev 11:15](#)).
7. The saints ([1 Cor 3:16–17](#); [2 Cor 6:16](#); [Eph 2:21–22](#)).⁵⁰

Each of these seven different meanings he investigated to determine the best interpretation for the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#). In view of its “cleansing” he reasoned that the sanctuary could not be Christ, for He was not impure, or heaven, for that was not unclean; it could not be literal Judah, for that was cut off and was no more a nation; it could not be the temple nor the Holy of Holies in the temple of Jerusalem, for they were destroyed. He concluded, therefore, that only two things could be called a sanctuary—the EARTH and the CHURCH: when these are cleansed, then, and not until then, will the entire sanctuary of God be cleansed, and *justified*, (as it reads in the margin).⁵¹

The earth, he felt, would be cleansed by fire when the Lord should come, and at that time the saints would be cleansed or justified. “The whole church will then be cleansed from all uncleanness, and presented without spot or wrinkle [[Eph 5:27](#)], and then be clothed with fine linen, clean and white [[Rev 19:8](#)].... ‘Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,’ when the will of God is done in earth as in heaven.”⁵² Thus the two events, the cleansing of the church and the earth, were joined. This became the predominant view among the Millerites.⁵³

However, some noted Millerites held somewhat different views. Apollos Hale, the associate editor of the *Signs of the Times* interpreted the sanctuary as the promised land, for it “must be capable of being ‘trodden underfoot,’ and of being ‘cleansed,’ and, ... of being cleansed at the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the righteous dead.”⁵⁴ From this perspective the cleansing of the sanctuary meant “1. its purification from the wicked agents of its desolation, and, 2. the removal of the curse which is upon it, at the termination of its predicted desolation. [Isa. 1:27](#), [28](#), [49:13–17](#), [19](#).⁵⁵

Josiah Litch (1809–1886), another prominent Millerite, interpreted the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) in the context of [Hebrews 8:1–2](#). He stated, “For that the sanctuary means the church, is evident from [Heb. 8:1–2](#).... The church, then, is the true sanctuary, of which Christ is the High Priest.”⁵⁶ The temple of [Revelation 11:1–2](#) he also saw as the “church of Christ.”⁵⁷

The cleansing of the sanctuary meant that the church would “be cleansed from all defilements and corruption at the resurrection of the just; and be presented spotless before His throne, with exceeding joy.”⁵⁸ Concerning “the host” ([8:13](#)) he wrote that “this people were emphatically God’s people, His visible church. The whole church and all the members of it are to be in a depressed and imperfect state until the end of the 2300 days, and then be cleansed.”⁵⁹

At the same time Litch stated that the sanctuary represented “the mountain where Christ will dwell, in the land of promise,” or “the mountain of thine [the Lord’s] inheritance” ([Exod 15:17](#); [Ps 78:54](#), [67–69](#); [132:13–14](#)).⁶⁰ In reference to its cleansing, he remarked that “throughout the Scriptures, we find Jerusalem and Zion personified and addressed as a living, sentient being—as being guilty—condemned—punished—pardoned.”⁶¹ But finally, Mount Zion, or Jerusalem, which was presently desolate would be “justified and pardoned, and built up at the end of the 2300 years” to become the capital of God’s kingdom.⁶²

The prophecy of the 70 weeks ([Dan 9:24](#)) brought to light Christ’s priestly ministry. Litch saw a typological relationship between the earthly sanctuary services and Christ’s work. Commenting on the last event of verse [24](#), “the anointing of the Most Holy,” he said that “it was ‘the Holy of Holies,’ ‘Heaven itself,’ which the Holy of Holies in the tabernacle was a type, which was consecrated [anointed] for us by the sacrifice of Christ, and His appearing there with His own blood for us.”⁶³ He noted that it was “heaven itself, which Christ consecrated, when He ascended and entered it, sprinkling or consecrating it with His own blood for us.”⁶⁴

Miller, however, remarked that “the Most Holy, in this passage, must mean Christ.”⁶⁵

Here we should also mention Litch’s understanding of the judgment. His view was instrumental in bringing about new insights into Christ’s sanctuary ministry after the 1844 disappointment. Litch pointed out that the judgment had two dimensions: a judicial trial and a penal executive judgment. Obviously the trial must precede the execution of the judgment. Since the latter would take place at the resurrection, he felt that the trial must necessarily precede the Second Advent.

In the trial God would preside, while in the execution Christ would have all authority. The trial had two phases. The first phase dealt with the dead. After human probation would close, when Christ had completed His function as mediator, Litch said that “the judgment or trial” would proceed to the living. Then “Christ will appear in the clouds of heaven and come to the Ancient of days [[Dan 7:13](#)] and the scene of trial, to announce the verdict with a shout, and deliver all his saints as soon as they are declared innocent or justified, and raise them to eternal life.”⁶⁶ He added that “we are now justified by faith,” but we still must be “declared justified at the day of judgment, before the effects of the Fall will be taken away, and the saints be restored to God’s perfect image and glory.”⁶⁷

New Developments

When the anticipated year for the termination of the 2300-year prophecy arrived, attention turned to Christ’s high-priestly ministry in heaven. This development was prompted by attempts to discover the exact end of the prophetic period in [Daniel 8:14](#).

One of the first persons to establish a relation between Christ’s priestly ministry and [Daniel 8:14](#) was Litch. Because of the prophetic relationship between [Daniel 9:24](#) and [8:14](#), he believed that if he could determine the exact ending of the 70 weeks/490 years, he could also know the precise termination of the 2300 years.

Litch suggested that the end of the 70 weeks was marked by the beginning of Christ’s ministry in heaven, because “the last event which was to take place in the 70 weeks, was the anointing of the MOST HOLY, or literally, the HOLY OF HOLIES, the Sanctum Sanctorum [[Dan 9:24](#).]”⁶⁸ Noticing a typological relationship in Leviticus, Daniel, and Hebrews between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary ministry he wrote:

“This anointing [of the earthly sanctuary—[Ex. 30:25–31](#); [Lev. 8:10–13](#)] took place immediately previous to and preparatory for the presentation of the blood of the sin offering in the holy place.

“That ark built by Moses, was a perfect pattern of the tabernacle in heaven, whither Christ is for us entered with His blood as the sin offering, which He shed without the camp. See [Heb. 7](#)th to the 10th chapters.

“What, therefore, Moses and the high priest did in the pattern, Christ our prophet and priest did in the true tabernacle, heaven itself. That must have been anointed immediately after His ascension into heaven, and before the Pentecost, because the peaceful answer then came, the evidence that he prevailed before the Mercy seat.”⁶⁹

Thus Litch expected the 2300 years to terminate with “the anniversary of the ascension,” that is, in the spring of 1843.⁷⁰

About the same time Miller published an article suggesting that the Jewish ceremonial feasts had the key to the end of the 2300 years. Assuming that these feasts had a prophetic-typological fulfillment, he pointed out that one “will find all the ceremonies of the typical law that [were] observed in the first month [Abib or Nisan of the Jewish year], or vernal equinox, had their fulfillment in Christ’s first advent and sufferings; but all the feasts and ceremonies in the seventh month [Tishri] or autumn equinox, can only have their fulfillment at His second advent.”⁷¹ He continued then to explain [Daniel 8:14](#) in the light of the Day of Atonement:

(1) “The sanctuary, and worshipers, and all appertaining to it, were cleansed on the seventh month tenth to seventeenth day.” ([Lev 16:29–34](#)). (2) “The atonement was made on the tenth day seventh month, and this is certainly typical of the atonement Christ is now making for us” ([Lev 16:1–34](#); [Heb 9:1–28](#)). (3) “When the high priest came out of the Holy of Holies after making the atonement, he blessed the people. [Lev. 9:22](#), [23](#); [2 Sam. 6:18](#). So will our great High Priest. [Heb. 9:28](#). This was on the seventh month tenth day.”⁷² According to this reasoning he did not expect Christ’s coming until after the autumn equinox of 1843.

*It should be noticed that, unlike many of his contemporaries, Miller held that the atonement was not made on the cross. Christ made a “propitiatory sacrifice” at the cross but the atonement was made “by his life and intercession in heaven, [Heb. 7:25](#).*⁷³

The following year, Samuel S. Snow (1806–1870) arrived at an exact date for the end of the prophetic period. He refined Miller’s reasoning about the Jewish feasts as types to be fulfilled by Christ at both His first and second advents. According to Snow the vernal types which had been fulfilled at the First Advent were:

1. The Passover with its antitype in the death of Christ as the passover lamb ([1 Cor 5:7](#)).

2. The offering of the first fruits of the harvest on the morning after the Sabbath ([Lev 23:6–7](#), [10–11](#)) with its antitype in the resurrection of Christ as the first fruits from the dead ([1 Cor 15:20–23](#)).

3. The Feast of Weeks ([Lev 23:15–16](#)), seen as the anniversary of the Lord’s descent on Mount Sinai at the giving of the Law, with its antitype in the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost.⁷⁴

On the other hand the autumn types that were observed during the seventh month of the Jewish year had not as yet met their antitypical fulfillments. They, therefore, were to be fulfilled at the Second Advent. It was the Day of Atonement type that led Snow to calculate the exact termination of [Daniel 8:14](#).

He stated that on the Day of Atonement, the tenth day of the seventh month, “the high priest went into the Most Holy Place of the tabernacle, presenting the blood of the victim before the mercy seat, after which on the same day he came out and blessed the waiting congregation of Israel. See [Lev. 9:7](#), [22](#), [23](#), [24](#), and [Lev. 16](#)th chap; [Heb. 5:1–6](#), and [9:1–12](#), [27](#), [28](#). Now the important point in this type is the completion of the reconciliation at the coming of the high priest out of the holy place. The high priest was a type of Jesus our high priest; the most holy place a type of heaven itself; and the coming out of the high priest a type of the coming of Jesus the second time to bless His waiting people. As this was on the tenth day of the 7th month so on that day Jesus will certainly come, because not a single point of the law is to fail. All must be fulfilled.”⁷⁵ In 1844 the tenth of the seventh month fell on October 22 [Karaite reckoning].

It was a rather general belief that Christ, as the antitypical high priest, had entered into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary, or heaven, upon His ascension to perform His intercessory work. Consequently the Millerites concluded that after the completion of this ministry, Christ would come from the Most Holy Place to bless His people, just as the Levitical high priest did on the Day of Atonement.

Close of Christ’s Mediation

At first the Millerites expected that the 2300 years would end sometime during the Jewish year of 1843 (extending from the spring of 1843 to the spring of 1844).⁷⁶ When this year came to a close in the spring of 1844, the believers were quite disappointed that their Lord had not returned. During the next months there was much uncertainty until calculations by Samuel Snow aroused the attention of the believers.

In July the calculation of the exact date of Christ’s return stirred many with an enormous enthusiasm that spread like wildfire. The fervor quickly came to be known as the “seventh-month movement” because the expected date fell in the seventh month of the Jewish year. The specific date was calculated by an older form of the Jewish calendar attributed to the Karaite Jews.

Millerite understanding of Christ’s parable of the ten virgins had a strong influence on the revival. Because of its later impact on Seventh-day Adventist understanding of Christ’s sanctuary ministry, it is necessary to describe briefly its significance.

The Millerites, like other Christians, saw the parable of [Matthew 25:1–13](#) as a prophecy of the last days. Miller interpreted the ten virgins as “mankind in general”—the five wise virgins as “the believers in God, or the children of the kingdom;” the five foolish virgins as the “unbelieving class of mankind while in this probationary state under the means of grace;” the lamps as a “figure of the word of God;” and the oil as the “emblem of faith.”⁷⁷

He identified the bridegroom with Christ. The marriage would occur when Christ, the bridegroom, came the second time to this earth to present the church as His bride to the Father and marry her so that she would be forever with Him.⁷⁸

The “midnight cry” Miller saw accomplished and fulfilled in the current widespread preaching of the imminent return of Christ. The public reaction to this message was bringing about the distinction between the foolish and wise virgins, culminating in the “shut door” ([Matt 25:10](#)). This closed door, according to Miller, was the “closing up of the mediatorial kingdom, and finishing the gospel period.”⁷⁹

Just before the Second Advent he expected that the “gospel or mediatorial time [would] cease. No more time for mercy, no more Spirit to strive with you, sinner, no more means of grace, no more repentance unto life, no more hopes for heaven, for Jesus has sworn by Himself, ... that your day of probation ‘should be no longer.’ For ‘he that is filthy shall be filthy still’ [[Rev 22:11](#)]. The Bridegroom has come and shut to the door.”⁸⁰

Initially, Miller, Litch, and other believers expected the close of human probation to take place with the fall of the Ottoman Empire in August of 1840.⁸¹

When in the middle of 1844 many embraced Snow’s position, the subsequent revival of missionary enthusiasm was recognized as a fulfillment of the parable.⁸² Now “the Midnight Cry,” “Behold the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him” had become the proclamation of the seventh-month movement. Acceptance of this message meant salvation to believers; rejection would bring about a condition similar to that of the foolish virgins after the door was shut ([Matt 25:1–12](#)). This was expected to take place within a few days before or on October 22, 1844.

On October 16 the editorial of the *Advent Herald* read that the “work is now finished, and that all we have to do is to go out to meet the Bridegroom, and trim our lamps accordingly.... Now we feel that our controversies are all over, that the battle has been fought, and our warfare ended.”⁸³ Thus, in the minds of the believers, Christ was to close His high-priestly mediation for the world at the end of the prophetic period of [Daniel 8:14](#).

Chapter II

Among Sabbatarian Adventists

(1845–1850)

P. Gerard Damsteegt

Early Expositions

Editorial Synopsis. The Millerites understood the parable of the ten virgins as a prophecy of the Second Advent ([Matt 25:1–13](#)), the wise and foolish virgins symbolizing the believing and unbelieving classes of humankind. The Bridegroom depicted Christ coming for His bride, the church. The short “seventh-month movement” intensified the focus on the Bridegroom.

Millerites who searched for an explanation of the Disappointment wrestled with this parable. The issue was whether Christ was represented as the “King of glory” coming to *the earth* for His bride, the church, or whether it depicted Him as the bridegroom coming to the Ancient of days in *heaven* for His marriage to His kingdom, the bride/wife as defined by the book of Revelation ([Rev 19:7; 21:9–14](#); [Dan 7:13–14](#)). In fact, Hiram Edson expressed the latter view the day following October 22.

I saw distinctly and clearly that instead of our High Priest coming out of the Most Holy of the heavenly sanctuary to come to this earth on the tenth day of the seventh month, at the end of the 2300 days, that He for the first time entered on that day the Second Apartment of that sanctuary; and that He had a work to perform in the Most Holy Place before coming to this earth. *That he came to the marriage at that time; in other words, to the Ancient of days to receive a kingdom, dominion, and glory; and we must wait for His return from the wedding.* [Emphasis added.]

The Bridegroom theme—that Christ’s marriage took place in heaven at His reception of the kingdom ([Dan 7:13–14](#))—was more fully developed by Apollos Hale and Joseph Turner, two Millerite editors. Ellen G. Harmon was led to a similar understanding by revelation. The view became the accepted position of Sabbatarian Adventists who saw it as an evidence of the genuineness of their Advent experience in the seventh-month movement. (See [GC 426](#).)

Although many Millerites as individuals searched for the reasons for their disappointment, the presentation by Owen R. L. Crosier probably contributed the most to the positions adopted by Sabbatarian Adventists (especially his article, “The Law of Moses, *Day Star*,” Extra, February 1846). Later reprints of his argumentation by Seventh-day Adventists omitted those aspects of his exposition that were felt to be inaccurate.

Crosier sought the meaning of the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) through plain Scripture teaching on the topic and through sanctuary typology. He established from the Bible that there were two sanctuaries: the earthly sanctuary of the first covenant ([Heb 9:1](#)) and the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant ([Heb 8:1–6](#)). The sanctuary in [Daniel 8:14](#) referred to the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant because its treading down and cleansing occurs *after* the Crucifixion. The year/day principle (2300 days/years) places the cleansing of this sanctuary well into the Christian era.

Both references to the sanctuary in [Daniel 8:11](#) and [8:14](#) referred to Christ’s sanctuary (contra Miller). The papacy polluted the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant through its blasphemous acts; in this sense the papacy cast the sanctuary down from its place in heaven and established a “counterfeit ‘temple of God.’” This identification ruled out Palestine or the earth as the sanctuary.

On the basis of sanctuary typology Crosier rejected the general opinion that Christ was to have come from the Most Holy Place at the end of the 2300 days/years. He argued instead that Christ had two phases of priestly ministry to perform—one beginning at His ascension, corresponding to the holy place; the second, beginning on October 22, 1844, corresponding to the Most Holy Place.

The central issue in Crosier’s presentation pertained to the subject of the atonement. His discussion must be understood in the light of the Millerite understanding of the term: (1) Calvary was an offering or sacrifice for sin, not an atonement. (2) Atonement related to the priestly mediation of the merits of sacrificial blood. The *priest* made atonement when he ministered the blood.

From this background Crosier argued that the priests made atonement in the daily service and the holy place in behalf of individuals for *the forgiveness of sins*. On the other hand the high priest made atonement in the yearly service in the Most Holy Place in behalf of the entire nation of Israel for *the blotting out of sins* that had been transferred to it during the year.

The heavenly sanctuary had two apartments, not one. Scriptural support was found in the plural forms (holy places) used in the original as translated by James Macknight. Sanctuary typology also supported this view. He asked, “If there be but one place in the heavens, as many say, why are there two in the figure? And why, in applying the figure, does Paul [Hebrews] speak of two [plural forms of *to hagion*]?”

Thus, the two holy places reflect the two distinct phases of Christ’s atonement ministry: the atonement for forgiveness of sins in the first apartment, and the atonement for the blotting out of sins in the Second Apartment, the action that would take place during the antitypical day of atonement.

Crosier identified Christ’s cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary with the removal of the moral uncleanness that had defiled it. The sanctuary could only be “defiled by mortals through his [Christ’s] agency, and for them cleansed by the same agency.” He interpreted the cleansing in the context of three things: (1) the reconciliation of the “things on earth” with the “things in heaven” ([Col 1:19–20](#)); (2) the preparation of a place for the believers ([John 14:2–3](#)); and (3) the purification of the heavenly sanctuary ([Heb 9:23](#)).

One of Crosier’s points of major importance was his reasoned argument that the antitypical day of atonement was not a *point* of time (contra Bates), but a *period* of time, extending from 1844 to the end of the millennium when redemptive history would be complete. The gospel dispensation, that is, the dispensation of grace, did not cease on October 22. In other words, human probation still remained open during the period of Christ’s final atonement ministry in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary.

Crosier also examined the defilement of the sanctuary. He perceived that the sanctuary in the type could be defiled either through the open transgressions of unclean and apostate priests and people, or through the ritual processes of sacrifice and the confession of sins. In the light of the immediate context of [Daniel 8](#) he placed the responsibility for the defilement of the heavenly sanctuary on Rome and apostate Christianity (little horn), the power that threw down Christ’s ministry in the heavenly sanctuary by substituting a counterfeit priesthood that professes to do what Christ actually does in His sanctuary. This was the antitypical defiling of the heavenly sanctuary by open transgression and apostasy.

The typical defilement of the sanctuary occurred in the process of the ritual when the sinner confessed his sins and offered the appropriate sacrifice. The priestly ministry of the blood (making atonement) transferred the iniquity from the person to the sanctuary; the penitent was forgiven. In the antitype the sins of the penitent are put on Christ and through His blood transferred to the heavenly sanctuary.

On the typical Day of Atonement sacrificial blood was not used to transfer sins, but rather to cleanse the sanctuary and to blot out the previously forgiven sins. So Crosier reasoned that just as the heavenly sanctuary was defiled by the sins of people through the “agency” of Christ, so it is to be cleansed by the “same agency.”

As a result of Christ’s antitypical day of atonement ministry, the sanctuary would be cleansed; the sins of God’s repentant people would be blotted out; the unrepentant would have to bear their own sins; and Satan (whom he identified as the scapegoat) would receive back the sins of the righteous.

Further study by Sabbatarian Adventists in the lapse of time would bring increasing clarification and insight to the views regarding the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) that began to form and solidify after the terrible disappointment on October 22.

Section Outline

- I. Introduction
- II. Bridegroom Theme
- III. Cleansing of the Sanctuary
- IV. Defilement of the Sanctuary

Introduction

When October 22, 1844 passed, the Millerite Adventists experienced extreme disappointment, and the unity of belief was shattered. Half a year later Apollos Hale, a leading Millerite editor, distinguished four major classes of Adventists: (1) those who deplored and condemned their past advent experience and strongly objected to any further time calculations; (2) those who expressed confidence in the former calculations and felt that the predicted events had taken place; (3) those whose confidence had been shaken so that they were afflicted with doubt; (4) those who continued time setting, building their calculations upon anything they could find.¹

We will focus our attention on the second group since the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary doctrine emerged from it. These persons acknowledged the seventh-month movement as a fulfillment of Bible prophecy.

The group, however, was far from being homogeneous. Individuals expressed different views on the subject of Christ’s high-priestly ministry on and after October 22, 1844, and its implications for the world.²

In their search for an explanation for the October 22 disappointment these Adventists had two major problems to solve: (1) What was signified by the coming of the Bridegroom if the parable ([Matt 25:1–13](#)) had its fulfillment in the seventh-month movement, and if the coming did *not* symbolize the Second Advent? (2) What was the meaning of the cleansing of the sanctuary ([Dan 8:14](#)) if the 2300 days had terminated on October 22?

The subject of Christ’s high-priestly ministry eventually provided the key, a biblical solution to these two problems. As will be discussed below, the result was a development of two new interpretations: (1) The coming of the Bridegroom symbolized Christ’s coming to the Most Holy Place in the heavenly sanctuary on October 22, and (2) the cleansing of the sanctuary revealed the nature of His ministry from that time on. Upon completion of this ministry Christ would return to earth.

Bridegroom Theme

Hiram Edson

One of the earliest interpretations of the Disappointment endorsing the validity of the seventh-month movement and its time calculations came from Hiram Edson (1806–1882), a Millerite leader in Port Gibson, New York. On the day following the Disappointment he felt impressed, after prayer, that a mistake had been made in the *manner* Adventists had expected Christ to come as the bridegroom, but not in the predicted *time*.

He wrote, “After breakfast I said to one of my brethren, ‘Let us go and see and encourage some of our born [brethren].’ We started, and while passing through a large field I was stopped about midway of the field. Heaven seemed open to my view, and I saw distinctly and clearly that instead of our High Priest *coming out* of the Most Holy of the heavenly sanctuary to come to this earth on the tenth day of the seventh month, at the end of the 2300 days, that He for the first time *entered* on that day the Second Apartment of that sanctuary; and that He had a work to perform in the Most Holy before coming to this earth. That He came to the marriage at that time; in other words, to the Ancient of days to receive a kingdom, dominion, and glory; and we must wait for His return *from the wedding*.³

In Edson’s interpretation, the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) was the heavenly sanctuary, not the earth or the church. He blamed “modern orthodoxy” for the interpretation “that the coming of the Bridegroom to the marriage would be fulfilled in the personal second advent of Christ to this earth.”⁴ Instead he placed the coming of the Bridegroom to the marriage in the context of [Daniel 7:13–14](#) and related it to the coming of Christ as the high priest to the Second Apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. Thus, according to Edson, on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, Christ came to the “marriage,” that is, to His reception of the kingdom, dominion, and glory.

Enoch Jacobs

An editorial by Enoch Jacobs in the *Western Midnight Cry*, December 1844, alluded to the coming of Christ in the setting of the judgment and made a distinction between a preadvent judgment and an executive judgment at the time of the Second Advent.⁵

Apollos Hale/Joseph Turner

One of the most extensive early treatments of the Bridegroom theme appeared in the first and only issue of the *Advent Mirror*, January 1845. According to its editors, Apollos Hale and Joseph Turner, the parable had to be interpreted in a “spiritual or figurative sense.”⁶ The current issue, they said, is whether Christ is represented as the bridegroom coming to the *earth* as the “King of glory,” or as the bridegroom coming to the marriage of the Lamb in *heaven*.

From [Revelation 21:9–14](#) they saw that the bride was defined as the “great city, the holy Jerusalem,”⁷ and cited as collaborative evidence the typological relationship between [Galatians 4:26](#) and [Ezekiel 16](#). “What Old Jerusalem was to the Church under the old covenant, that the New Jerusalem is to be, to the Church under the new covenant in its perfected state. As Jehovah declares that He married the Old Jerusalem, [Ezekiel 16](#), so the Son of God is to be married to the New Jerusalem.”⁸

On the basis of [Matthew 22:8–14](#) they said the believers were the guests at the marriage of the Lamb. Furthermore, they argued that the marriage had to take place *before* Christ could come as the king of glory to this earth. His actual coming was symbolized by His *return from the wedding* ([Luke 12:35–37](#)).

The “marriage” symbolized the inauguration of Christ as the king of glory, on which occasion He would receive His “kingdom, city and throne,”⁹ “the actual investment of Christ with ‘the throne.’”¹⁰ Therefore, they concluded, the coming of the Bridegroom ([Matt 25:10](#)) denoted “that change in His [Christ’s] heavenly state, in which He comes to the Ancient of Days to receive dominion, and glory, which we know must take place before He can come in His glory.”¹¹

Because Adventists were guests at the heavenly marriage, the editors suggested that believers were “now in the guest-chamber, where all depends on our keeping our garments.”¹² Thus, they indicated an intimate relationship between the change in Christ’s work in heaven and a change in the believer’s responsibility on earth:

“The coming of the Bridegroom would point out some change of work or office, on the part of our Lord, in the invisible world; and the going in with Him a corresponding change on the part of His true people. With Him it is within the veil—where He has gone to prepare a place for us; with them it is outside the veil, where they are to wait and keep themselves ready till they pass in to the marriage supper.”¹³

In February and March of 1845 Hale published two articles on the same subject. In these he provided a hermeneutical foundation for the new interpretation of [Matthew 25:10](#), aimed at harmonizing the various passages regarding Christ’s marriage. He said that in the exposition of the parable ([Matt 25](#)) Miller’s rules of Bible interpretation had not been applied consistently. However, the new interpretation had eliminated this inaccuracy by a more precise application of the principles of analogy of Scripture and of common sense.¹⁴

Hale also stressed the necessity of a preparatory work to be done in the New Jerusalem in connection with the inauguration of Christ as king on His throne. This preparatory work he explained in the light of Christ’s atoning ministry for the purification of the “true tabernacle” ([Heb 8:2; 9:23](#)) which he identified with the “heavenly Jerusalem” ([Rev 21:2–3](#)).¹⁵ However, this work of purification was not identified with the sanctuary cleansing of [Daniel 8:14](#), but was to precede that process.¹⁶

William Miller

For a time even Miller was impressed by the various aspects of the Bridegroom theme as presented by Hale and Turner. In a letter to Joseph Marsh he admitted that [Matthew 25:10](#) could not refer to the Second Advent, this event being referred to in [Luke 12:36](#). He affirmed that Christ had come in the sense spoken of in [Matthew 25:10](#).¹⁷ A little later, however, he abandoned this view.

Ellen G. Harmon

In January 1846 the *Day Star* published a vision of Ellen G. Harmon (known after her marriage as Ellen G. White). The vision, which occurred in December 1844, depicted a place in heaven similar to the Most Holy Place of the earthly sanctuary and described it in terms of [Hebrews 9:3–5](#) and the marriage supper of the Lamb.¹⁸ This suggested the physical reality of a heavenly sanctuary.

In March 1846 the *Day Star* published another vision Ellen Harmon received in February 1845. This account portrayed the coming of the Bridegroom to the marriage, a view held also by Edson, Hale, and Turner. It described a transition in Christ’s ministry within the heavenly sanctuary. She saw Jesus as the intercessor for His people, sitting on a throne with the Father in the holy place of the sanctuary. Then both left this throne and entered into the Most Holy Place where Jesus, as “a great High Priest,” standing before the Father, would receive the kingdom ([Dan 7:13–14](#)).¹⁹

The Adventists are to keep their “garments spotless,” for in “a little while” Christ would “return from the wedding” ([Luke 12:36](#)). Adventists who had been deceived were ignorant of the view of the coming of the Bridegroom and were described as being under the influence of Satan.²⁰

Because these ideas had been communicated in a vision, they were accepted by some Adventists as a confirmation by God of the correctness of the Bridegroom theme and the seventh-month movement. However, although Ellen Harmon’s revelations seem to have been “well known, and much talked about at that time,”²¹ the great majority of Adventists remained skeptical of visions,²² and beliefs based on them.

Division on the Bridegroom Interpretation

Although the Bridegroom theme enabled Adventists to adhere to the validity of the seventh-month movement as well as the contemporary shut-door opinions, gradually the latter was rejected by most of them. They preferred to explain the Disappointment as an error in *time* calculation, not a mistake in the *manner* they had expected Christ to come. One of the main arguments for rejecting the interpretation that Christ (the bridegroom) had come to the Ancient of days and that the door was shut was that it departed from the traditional view that held the text to symbolize the Second Advent.

A strong controversy developed between those who accepted the Bridegroom theme and those who rejected it. According to Eli Curtis, a supporter of this new view, there was “no other prophecy than that of the parable of the ten virgins” which caused so much opposition and division among Adventists.²³ Sabbatarian Adventists, however, saw the Bridegroom theme as one of the strongest evidences of the genuineness of the Advent experience.

Toward an Understanding of a Two-Phased Ministry

After the Disappointment as various Adventists restudied the subject of the sanctuary and its cleansing, new concepts of soteriology came to light. Hiram Edson, who identified the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) with the heavenly sanctuary, provided one of the earliest. He pointed out that Christ did not come out of the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary as expected, but instead *had entered* for the first time into that Second Apartment to perform a special work—the reception of the kingdom, dominion, and glory.²⁴

In February 1845 a corresponding view seems to have surfaced in Boston,²⁵ about the same time Ellen Harmon received her Bridegroom vision with a similar content.²⁶ Soon after this, two Adventist periodicals, the *Hope Within the Veil* and the *Hope of Israel* (published in Portland, Maine, where Ellen G. Harmon had related her views), began to circulate similar ideas, which carried them as far as upstate New York and Ohio.²⁷

The *Hope Within the Veil* seems to have taught that the two apartments of the tabernacle represented “two dispensations, or two divisions of the covenant,” and that Jesus had entered into the “Holy of Holies” to begin His atonement on October 22, 1844.²⁸ The *Hope of Israel* said that now Adventists were “in the marriage, in the holiest with Jesus.”²⁹

In April 1845 the *Hope of Israel* published an article by Owen R. L. Crosier (1820–1913), a friend of Edson’s and for a brief time a Sabbatarian Adventist, claiming that the antitypical day of atonement was not to be finished in one literal day.³⁰ Crosier remarked that “the last call of mercy to the world” was completed in the fall of 1844 and that on the tenth day of the seventh month Jesus had entered “upon the office of bridegroom” to perform “the final atonement for his people.... Our great High Priest is now making the atonement for His whole Israel.”³¹

Crosier rejected the idea that Christ had “left the mercy seat, and hence that all access by prayer is cut off,” stating that “the mercy seat is in the Holiest of all.... So that *He has approached directly to the mercy seat.*” With reference to [Hebrews 10:19–27](#) he pointed out that “here Paul teaches us that *now* we have *liberty* [margin] to enter into the *Holiest* by the blood of Jesus who is the High Priest over the *house of God.*”³²

Toward an Understanding of the Cleansing of the Sanctuary

In September 1845 Otis Nichols, being familiar with the Bridegroom vision, employed the analogy-of-Scripture principle to the sanctuary. He concluded that “the 10th of the 7th month is a landmark and a glorious light for us now to look back upon,” because at that time the Bridegroom “suddenly came to his temple, [Mal. 3:1](#), which ‘was opened in heaven’ [Rev 11:19], after the 7th angel began to sound, [Lev. 16:33](#), [Heb. 9:3–4](#) to finish the atonement for the people, and cleansing of the sanctuary, [Heb. 9:23](#).³³

In March 1845 Hale had explained the delay of the Second Advent by referring to a purification ([Heb 8–9; Lev 16](#)) of the heavenly Jerusalem—the true tabernacle and antitype of the earthly tabernacle. He designated the process as “atonement” and believed it must be accomplished before Christ’s return.³⁴

In the same month Hale’s article appeared, another article appeared that tried (by typology) to harmonize the Levitical high-priestly ministry with the completion of Christ’s atoning ministry on the antitypical day of atonement. It concluded that prior to October 22, 1844, Christ, as man’s advocate, fulfilled the antitype of the Jewish high priest in his daily ministry. But on the tenth day of the seventh month Jesus, as the antitype of the “dead and living goat” ([Lev 16](#)), entered into “the Holy place, or inner court... and shut the door” to make the atonement. On the same day the atonement was completed (October 22, 1844) He *came out* of that place as the bridegroom to receive His kingdom. Since that day His work as mediator and high priest was confined to God’s people.³⁵

A few months later G. W. Peavey, a strong defender of the seventh-month movement, stated that Christ had “closed the work typified by the daily ministrations previous to the 10th day of the 7th month, and on that day went into the holiest of all, presenting his blood once for all for those who had accepted of his mediation at that time.”³⁶ Peavey saw an interrelationship between [Daniel 8:14](#); [Hebrews 9:23–24](#); and [Leviticus 16:16](#), and concluded that the “heavenly things” needed purification with Christ’s blood “BECAUSE OF THE UNCLEANNESS OF THE CHILDREN of Israel.” He felt that both the cleansing of the sanctuary and the termination of the atonement occurred on October 22, 1844.³⁷

Through the influence of Turner, Snow accepted the Bridegroom theme and the idea that the atonement was finished.³⁸ Now Snow interpreted the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) as the Lord’s dwelling place—Zion, or the heavenly Jerusalem, which was “*the inheritance of our Lord and his people.*” Its justification, he said, was to be achieved “by the *atonement or reconciliation.*”

Employing typological reasoning Snow stated that like the type in [Leviticus 16](#), “so also in the antitype, the ‘HOLY SANCTUARY,’ i.e. Zion or Jerusalem must receive the atonement or reconciling on *the same day*, and thus be *pardon*ed or ‘*JUSTIFIED*.’” After its completion at the end of the 2300 days [Isaiah 40:1–2](#) had a “binding force upon God’s ministers.”³⁹

Heavenly Atonement Ministration: Not Finished in 1844

Discussions on whether Christ’s atoning ministry in heaven had ceased in the autumn of 1844 were of special significance. In October 1845 Crosier pointed out once more that the atonement had *not* been completed,⁴⁰ stating that “the brethren do not search it [the atonement] close enough. It is not yet finished; but we are in the Antitype of the tenth day Atonement.”⁴¹

In February 1846, Crosier, who was already familiar with many of the above mentioned positions, published an extensive treatise on the cleansing of the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) in the light of Christ’s continuing atoning ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. His treatise, “The Law of Moses,” was quickly commended by Ellen White⁴² and became a vital factor in the development of Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary theology.

While affirming that “righteousness comes not by the Law, but by faith in the promises [of God],” Crosier’s article advocated the relevance of the law of Moses for the period after the Disappointment.⁴³ He began by modifying the seventh-month movement position by the typological significance of the spring Jewish festivals. The complete fulfillment of these festivals, he said, did not take place at a point of time at the First Advent. The incarnation of Christ was only the beginning of their antitypical fulfillment which would not be completed until the end of the “gospel dispensation,” at the Second Advent.

By means of analogy, Crosier argued that the complete fulfillment of the autumn Jewish festivals, in particular, the Day of Atonement ([Lev 23:26–32](#)), would also cover “a dispensation of *many years.*”⁴⁴ In his opinion the antitype of the Day of Atonement, a time of restoration, would extend from the “end of the 2300 days” to the end of the millennium, when redemptive history would be complete.

Crosier then proceeded to establish the meaning of the sanctuary in [Daniel 8:14](#). Primarily he based the biblical rationale for his interpretation on two hermeneutical principles: The analogy of Scripture and typology. Through the former he analyzed scriptural references on the subject of the sanctuary and its services; through the latter he explored the relationship between the Levitical priestly ministry and Christ’s priestly ministry.⁴⁵

In his analysis of the biblical concept of the sanctuary Crosier established that there were two sanctuaries: the sanctuary of the first covenant ([Heb 9:1](#)) and that of the “better [the new] covenant” ([Heb 8:6](#)). [Daniel 8:14](#) referred to “*the Sanctuary* of the new covenant, for the vision of the treading down and cleansing, is after the Crucifixion.”⁴⁶ From this it is clear that Crosier arrived at the meaning of [Daniel 8:14](#) in harmony with the *larger context* of the chapter. Furthermore, he interpreted the passage on the basis of historicist exegesis, accepting the validity of the year-day principle for the 2300 day period.

The cleansing of the sanctuary, therefore, would continue well into the Christian era, making it imperative to understand this event in the new covenant setting. Identifying this sanctuary as the one in heaven, he remarked that “the sanctuary of the new covenant is connected with New Jerusalem, like the sanctuary of the first covenant was with Old Jerusalem.”⁴⁷

He believed this interpretation of the sanctuary in [Daniel 8:14](#) to be supported also by the immediate context. It was fully in harmony, said Crosier, with [8:11](#), “and the place of his sanctuary was cast down” (KJV). This text in itself, he noted, showed that the sanctuary could not be the earth or Palestine. The sanctuary cast down was Christ’s.

[Daniel 11:30–31](#) also was cited in support of his interpretation. The passage explained that apostate Christianity, in particular the papacy, would pollute the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant through blasphemous acts. In this sense, he said, the politico-religious apostate power cast the sanctuary down from its place in heaven to establish “the counterfeit ‘temple of God.’” This view, he felt, was further witnessed by [Daniel 8:13](#) which revealed that these blasphemous acts of the little horn caused the sanctuary to be “trodden underfoot” in the same way as the Son of God had been trodden underfoot ([Heb 10:29](#)).⁴⁸

Crosier then turned to [Daniel 8:14](#) in the light of the typological implications of the OT sanctuary ministry. He rejected the general opinion that at the end of the 2300 days Christ would come from the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary to the earth after completing the atonement in that place. Instead, he spoke of two phases of Christ’s ministry: one beginning at His ascension, when He entered the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, and a second beginning on October 22, 1844 when Christ for the first time entered the Most Holy Place.

Then Crosier proceeded to the central issue of his presentation: the typological relevance of the Levitical atonement to Christ’s high-priestly ministry in heaven. In elaborating on this he referred to the different aspects of the atonement in the OT sanctuary service:

“The atonement which the priests made for the people in connection with their daily ministration was different from that made on the tenth day of the 7th month. In making the former they went no further than in the holy; but to make the latter they entered the Holy of Holies—the former was made for individual cases, the latter for the whole nation of Israel collectively—the former was made for the *forgiveness of sins*, the latter for *blotting them out*—the former could be made at anytime, the latter only on the tenth day of the seventh month. Hence the former may be called the daily atonement and the latter the yearly, or the former the individual, and the latter the national atonement.”⁴⁹

This distinction between atonement for the forgiveness of sins and atonement for the blotting out of sins was one of the major elements of Crosier’s argumentation. In the context of [Leviticus 16](#) he stated that “the whole nation having had their sins previously forgiven by the atonement made in the holy, now assemble about their sanctuary, while the high priest... enters the Holy of Holies to make an atonement to *cleanse them*, that they may be *clean* from all their sins before the Lord, ver. 30.”⁵⁰

The antitype of the Levitical priesthood was fulfilled in Christ’s priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, the true tabernacle ([Heb 8–9](#)). According to Crosier the heavenly sanctuary, like the earthly, had two apartments, not one apartment as other Christians seemed to believe. Earlier, Edson and E. G. Harmon had already pointed to this division in the heavenly sanctuary. Crosier found scriptural support in the book of Hebrews.

He argued that the expressions “the holiest of all” ([Heb 9:8](#)) and “the holies” ([Heb 10:19](#)) were incorrect translations and, therefore, could not refer to the Most Holy Place. The Douai-Rheims Bible,⁵¹ he pointed out, translated these expressions as “the holies,” referring to a two-apartment sanctuary. Said he, “the word in ch. 9:8; 10:19, is *Hagion*, ‘of the Holies,’ instead of the ‘holiest of all;’ and shows that the blood of Christ is the way or means by which he, as our high priest, was to enter both apartments of the heavenly tabernacle.”⁵²

Crosier cited “the holies” of [Hebrews 9:8](#) as a reference to the “greater and more perfect tabernacle” ([Heb 9:11](#)); that is, the heavenly sanctuary. In addition, he pointed out that the word which had been translated “the holy place” in [Hebrews 9:12](#) had a plural form and should be translated “the holy places” as in [Hebrews 9:24](#). He added, “if there be but *one* place in the heavens, as many say, why were there two in the figure? And why, in applying the figure, does Paul speak of *two?*”⁵³

Joseph Bates supported the two-apartment sanctuary based on Macknight’s translation. According to Bates when one compares the Macknight translation with the Mosaic tabernacle the disputed passages become clearer. He placed the KJV texts parallel to Macknight’s version as follows:⁵⁴

King James’ Translation

The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the *holiest* of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing. [Heb. 9:8](#).

The Holy Ghost signifying this: that the way of the *holy places* was not yet laid open, while the first tabernacle still standeth. [Heb. 9:8](#).

Hath entered once into the *holy places*, not indeed by the blood of goats and of calves, but by *his own blood*, &c. (9:12.)

There was a necessity therefore that the representations indeed of the *holy places* in the heavens, should be cleansed by these sacrifices; but the heavenly *holy places* themselves by sacrifices better than these. (vs. 23.)

Therefore Christ hath not entered into the *holy places* made with hands, the images of the true *holy places* but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God on our account. (vs. 24.)

Well then brethren having boldness in the entrance of *holy places*, by the blood of Jesus; which entrance he hath dedicated for us, a way new and living through the veil, that is his flesh. (10:19–20.)

Thus, to underscore the typological relationship between the Levitical priestly ministry and that of Christ, Crosier understood the heavenly sanctuary to be divided into two different sections, reflecting two distinct phases of Christ’s atonement: the atonement of forgiveness of sins in the first apartment and the atonement of the blotting out of sins in the Second Apartment.

Crosier maintained that Christ’s atoning ministry did not commence on the cross but after His ascension, when He entered the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary to begin the antitypical daily ministration.⁵⁵ His atoning ministry would be completed with the “blotting out of sin with all its direful effects” during the antitypical day of atonement.⁵⁶

Crosier believed he found additional evidence for two phases in Christ’s heavenly atonement in Peter’s appeal on the day of Pentecost: “Repent ye therefore; and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord” ([Acts 3:19](#)). He commented that Peter “exhorts to repentance & conversion (turning away from sins); for what purpose? *That your sins may be (future) blotted out.*” Every one can see that the blotting out of sins does not take place at repentance & conversion; but follows and must of necessity be preceded by them.”⁵⁷

Crosier added that “repentance, conversion, and baptism had then become imperative duties in the present tense, and when performed, those doing them ‘washed away’ ([Acts 22:16](#)) remitted or sent away from them their sins ([Acts 2:38](#)); and of course are forgiven and have ‘received the atonement’ [[Rom 5:11](#)]; but they had not received it entire at that time, because their sins were not yet blotted out.”⁵⁸ The believer had advanced in the process of reconciliation just as far as the OT believer whose sins had been forgiven through the first apartment ministry. The Second Apartment type for the blotting out of sins foreshadowed the future day of atonement.

In this light Crosier interpreted [Acts 3:19](#) as a statement of two successive chronological periods in which repentance and conversion were associated with Christ’s daily atoning ministry in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary. The *blotting out of sins* was associated with His atoning ministry in the Second Apartment. The latter ministry would cleanse both the sanctuary and God’s people during the antitypical day of atonement commencing on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844.⁵⁹

Crosier identified Christ’s cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary ([Dan 8:14](#)) before the final resurrection with the removal of the moral uncleanness that had defiled it. The sanctuary, he said, could only be “defiled by mortals through His [Christ’s] agency, and for them cleansed by the same agency.”⁶⁰ He interpreted the cleansing in the context of the *reconciliation* of the “things on earth” with the “things in heaven” ([Col 1:19–20](#)), the preparation of a place for the believers ([John 14:2–3](#)), and the *purification* of the heavenly sanctuary ([Heb 9:23](#)).⁶¹ He believed the verbal ideas—to atone, reconcile, and cleanse—meant “the same” thing.⁶²

With reference to the purification mentioned in [Hebrews 9:23](#) he remarked, “The necessity of cleansing the heavenly things, is induced by the atonement being made therein by the blood of Christ for the remission or forgiveness of sins and purifying of our consciences. ‘And almost all things are by the law purged with blood.’ The patterns were purified ‘every year’ (ver. 25) with the blood of bulls and goats; but in the antitype of that yearly expiation the heavenly things themselves must be purified with the blood of the better sacrifice of Christ himself once offered. This reconciles the ‘things in heaven’ ([Col. 1:20](#)) and cleanses the sanctuary of the new covenant, [Dan. 8:14.](#)”⁶³

Crosier opposed the common interpretation of the scapegoat as a symbol of Christ ([Lev 16:8, 10, 20–22](#)). Instead, he insisted that it was a type of Satan.⁶⁴

After the cleansing of the sanctuary, but before the beginning of the millennium, “the antitype of confessing and putting the sins on the head of the scapegoat” would occur.⁶⁵

He identified the antitypical day of atonement with “the dispensation of the fullness of the times”⁶⁶ in which the Father “might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth” ([Eph 1:10](#)). During this dispensation “the different and sundered parts of the kingdom, Capitol and King ‘in heaven,’ the subjects and territory ‘on earth,’ are to be redeemed or gathered again into one kingdom under one ‘Head,’ of the Son of David.”⁶⁷

This period he also named an “age to come,” an age of repairs, and a time of restitution and restoration.⁶⁸ Said he, “This is the period of inheritance and follows that of heirship, the dispensation of grace, ch. 3:2, 6 [Eph].”⁶⁹

During this period of restoration—“blotting out of sin with all its direful effects”—the following major events would occur:

1. The cleansing of the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#).

2. The marriage between Christ and the New Jerusalem.

3. The transferal of sin to the scapegoat.

4. Christ’s return.

5. The cleansing of God’s people. First the sanctuary was to be cleansed, then the people.

6. The millennium.⁷⁰

Although the dispensation of the fullness of the times began in the fall of 1844, the gospel or dispensation of grace did not end at that time. The expression, “there should be time no longer” ([Rev 10:6](#)), could not refer to the Second Advent, for after this oath came the commission to prophesy again ([Rev 10:1](#)).⁷¹

Crosier pointed to [Revelation 10:6–7](#) for a description of “the manner in which time should close.”⁷² The “days” in [Revelation 10:7](#) indicated “a short period of time, in which not only the 7th angel begins to sound, but the mystery of God is finished.... Thus we see that the mystery is finished, not in a *point*, but in

Defilement of the Sanctuary

Crosier was one of the first to attempt to describe the dynamics by which the sanctuary was defiled. He perceived two ways the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) could be defiled. First, through transgression; second, through confession of sins.

By Apostate Transgression (Type)

Defilement of the typical sanctuary through transgression, he said, could occur by an unclean person's entering it ([Lev 12:4](#)), either the high priest ([Lev 21:12](#)), or apostate priests and people ([2 Chron 35:14](#); [Ezek 5:11](#); [23:38–39](#); [Zeph 3:4](#)).

By Rome and Apostate Christianity (Antitype)

Crosier discussed the antitypical sanctuary as defiled through transgression ([Dan 8:14](#)) in the *immediate context* of Daniel 8. The vision describes the casting down of the sanctuary ([Dan 8:11](#)) and its being trodden underfoot ([Dan 8:13](#)) by the little horn. Responsibility for the defilement of this heavenly sanctuary he put on Rome and apostate Christianity.

Crosier illustrated this in citing [Daniel 11:30–31](#) which revealed that "Rome and those that forsake the holy covenant" polluted the new covenant sanctuary. "It was the sanctuary of that covenant they polluted; which they could do as well as to pollute the name of God; [Jer. 34:16](#); [Ezek. 20](#); [Mal. 1:7](#). This was the same as profaning or blaspheming His name."⁸¹

The Roman Catholic Church, symbolized as a "politico-religious" beast polluted the sanctuary ([Rev. 13:6](#)) and cast it down from its place in heaven ([Ps. 102:19](#); [Jer. 17:12](#); [Heb. 8:1, 2](#)) when they called Rome the holy city ([Rev. 21:2](#)) and installed the pope there with the titles, 'Lord God the Pope,' 'Holy Father,' 'Head of the Church,' &c., and there, in the counterfeit 'temple of God' he professes to do what Jesus actually does in His sanctuary; [2 Thess. 2:1–8](#).⁸²

Confessed Sins Placed on Sacrifice (Type)

Crosier held also that typical defilement of the sanctuary occurred through the confession of sins. First he examined the first apartment service dealing with the atonement for the forgiveness of sins. Referring to [Numbers 5:6–8](#), he said it appeared that "confession and restitution are necessary in all cases before the atonement could be made."⁸³

When this was done, the individual or the elders (when the congregation was involved) brought the sacrificial animal to the sanctuary. Hands were placed on the animal's head and it was killed. Then the anointed priest "took some of the blood into the holy, and with his finger sprinkled it before the vail" of the Most Holy Place, "put some of it upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense," and "poured the remainder of the blood at the bottom of the altar [of burnt offering]." Thus, said he, the priest made "an atonement for the individual, and his sin was forgiven."⁸⁴

Crosier further remarked that in performing this atonement "the priests only entered the holy, and to make it [atonement] they could enter the apartment 'always' or 'daily.'" Through this service the iniquity was transferred from the people to the sanctuary. The individual ceased to bear his iniquity when he had done his part in presenting the killed sacrifice.

The medium through which sins were transferred, he wrote, was "through his victim, or rather its blood when the priest took and sprinkled it before the veil and on the altar."⁸⁵ Later Arnold wrote that the sins of Israel had been "imputed or laid [on the altar] during the year, through the blood of the victims daily offered."⁸⁶

Confessed Sins Placed on Christ (Antitype)

Crosier explained the antitypical defilement through confession as in harmony with the type. He wrote that the "Lamb on Calvary's cross is our victim slain; 'Jesus the mediator of the new Covenant' 'in the heavens' is our interceding High Priest."⁸⁷ In the heavenly sanctuary He makes "with his own blood ... the atonement and we are forgiven. [1 Pet. 2:24](#)."⁸⁸

In the type confessed sins are put on the sacrificial victim; in like manner through Christ's blood they are transferred to the sanctuary. Crosier wrote, "His body is the 'one sacrifice' for repenting mortals, to which their sins are imparted, and through whose blood in the hands of the living active Priest they are conveyed to the heavenly sanctuary."⁸⁹

Arnold stated that in the heavenly sanctuary "sins were daily imputed, or laid upon the altar through the blood of Christ, our victim, during the Gospel dispensation."⁹⁰

The service in the Second Apartment, Crosier pointed out, focussed on the blotting out of the sins of God's people through the cleansing of the sanctuary. Once a year, on the Day of Atonement, "an atonement" was made "for all Israel (the whole nation) for all their sins" ([Lev 16:34](#)).

"The whole nation," he noted, "having had their sins previously forgiven by the atonement made in the holy" now gathered around the sanctuary while the high priest entered into the Holy of Holies "before the Lord, the breast-plate of judgment on his heart with their names therein that he may bear their judgment," "bear the iniquities of the holy things," and "make an atonement to cleanse them, that they may be clean from all their sins before the Lord" ([Lev 16:30](#)).⁹¹

During the yearly Day of Atonement sacrificial blood again played a major role. This time, however, blood was not used to transfer sins; it functioned instead as an agent to cleanse the polluted sanctuary and the repentant people ([Lev 16:16–19, 30](#)).⁹²

The antitypical cleansing was explained in harmony with the "legal typical process of defiling and cleansing of the sanctuary through the agency of the priest." Crosier reasoned that as the heavenly sanctuary is defiled only by the sins of people through the "agency" of Christ, so it is to be cleansed by the "same agency."⁹³ As support for the cleansing he cited [Colossians 1:19–20](#), showing that the "blood of Christ is the means, and Christ Himself the agent of reconciling to the Father both the things in heaven and the things on earth."⁹⁴

[John 14:1–3](#), he noted, revealed the need for Christ to do a preparatory work for mankind in heaven. The nature of this work Crosier saw in [Hebrews 9:23](#): "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." He commented that the "patterns" represented the earthly sanctuary and the "heavenly things" the heavenly sanctuary ([Heb 9:11–12, 24](#)). These references, he maintained, show that it was necessary to purify the type.⁹⁵

As a result of Christ's antitypical day of atonement ministry, he expected the sanctuary to be cleansed, the repentant people to be clean and their sins blotted out, the unrepentant to bear their own sins, and Satan—the scapegoat—to have received back the sins of the righteous.⁹⁶

In relating the cleansing of the defiled heavenly sanctuary to the attitude of God's people, Edson wrote that those who were faithful had their sins blotted out, while the unfaithful or apostates had their names blotted out of the book of life.⁹⁷

An Expanding Doctrinal System

Editorial Synopsis. Sabbatarian Adventists believed in the reality of a two-partite sanctuary in heaven. They did not regard it as heaven itself or as some imaginary idea. The focus on Christ's priestly ministry in the Most Holy Place drew their attention to the "ark of his testament" (Rev 11:19) and in turn to the Decalogue within and the long-trampled-upon seventh-day Sabbath. The Sabbath was seen as a special test for God's people since the onset of Christ's ministry in the Most Holy Place. Its restoration and proclamation became "present truth."

Study of the sanctuary doctrine eventually linked Christ's Second Apartment ministry to the final judgment. An early suggestion associated the judgment of God's people with the "breastplate of judgment" upon which the names of Israel were inscribed and which the high priest carried upon His person as he ministered before the Lord. Joseph Bates argued that the judgment scene in Daniel 7 and the judgment hour message of Revelation 14 described the nature of Christ's post-1844 ministry in the Most Holy Place.

Bates saw the judgment in two phases: the first, to deal with God's professed people; the second, as the day of judgment on the wicked. The purpose of the judgment for God's people he described as, "to decide who is, and who is not worthy to enter the gates of the Holy City; while the Bridegroom, High Priest, Mediator, and crowned King of Israel stands before Him advocating the cause of all presented on His breastplate of judgment. As Daniel sees it, the judgment is now set and the books open."

By 1849 the Sabbath was being interpreted as "the seal of the living God." The cry of the third angel (Rev 14:9–13), with its emphasis on the commandments of God (vs. 12), was understood to constitute the sealing message that would prepare believers to be sealed with God's protection against the judgments of the seven last plagues.

Although at first most believed Christ's ministry had ended on October 22, the sanctuary doctrine proved helpful in broadening their concepts of salvation. It was seen that the antitypical day of atonement was not a point of time, but a *period of time* that would last until the end of the gospel dispensation. Thus Christ's priestly ministry of atonement continued.

At first His Second Apartment ministry was perceived to be limited to believers who had gone through the Disappointment. Later, when they discovered in the sanctuary types that forgiveness was offered even on the Day of Atonement itself, they concluded that people who had never been a part of the movement could find forgiveness and acceptance with God; however, they rejected the possibility of conversion for those who knowingly had rejected the Second Advent message.

Sanctuary views espoused by Sabbatarians differed substantially from general Millerite understanding. Two prominent differences were: (1) A two-phased priestly ministry for Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, the second beginning in 1844. Their opponents argued for a single-phased ministry in the Most Holy Place which they equated with Heaven itself, which began at His ascension. (2) The scapegoat symbolized Satan (Lev 16). Their opponents held that both goats used in the Day of Atonement ritual represented Christ.

Section Outline

- I. Reality of the Heavenly Sanctuary
- II. Sanctuary, Decalogue, and Sabbath
- III. Sanctuary and Judgment
- IV. Sanctuary and Sealing
- V. Sanctuary and Salvation
- VI. Contrasts With Contemporary Views

Reality of the Heavenly Sanctuary

The Seventh-day Adventist pioneers never doubted the existence of an actual physical structure of a bipartite heavenly sanctuary. The Mosaic tabernacle was its counterpart on earth. Their sanctuary doctrine depended on its objective reality.⁹⁸ They realized that without it there was no justification for their positions on Daniel 8:14 and the change in Christ's high priestly ministry on October 22, 1844.

Convictions based on their biblical interpretations were strengthened by the early visions of Ellen White. In December 1844 she was shown the physical reality of a place in heaven containing an ark similar to that in the Holy of Holies of the earthly sanctuary.⁹⁹ In February 1845 she received a vision revealing the transition Christ made as the bridegroom, going from the holy to the Holy of Holies in the heavenly sanctuary to receive the kingdom.¹⁰⁰ Several years later she was shown this transition in the light of Revelation 3:7–8. She commented, "[I] saw that Jesus had shut the door in the holy place, and no man can open it; and that he had opened the door in the Most Holy, and no man can shut it."¹⁰¹

On April 3, 1847 she received a more extensive view of the heavenly sanctuary. She wrote, "In the city I saw a temple, which I entered. I passed through a door before I came to the first veil. This veil was raised, and I passed into the holy place. Here I saw the altar of incense, the candlestick with seven lamps, and the table on which was the shewbread, etc. After viewing the glory of the holy, Jesus raised the second veil, and I passed into the Holy of Holies.

"In the Holiest I saw an ark; on the top and sides of it was purest gold. On each end of the ark was a lovely cherub, with their wings spread out over it. Their faces were turned toward each other, and they looked downward. Between the angels was a golden censer. Above the ark, where the angels stood, was an exceeding bright glory, that appeared like a throne where God dwelt. Jesus stood by the ark. And as the saints' prayers came up to Jesus, the incense in the censer would smoke, and He offered up the prayers of the saints with the smoke of the incense of His Father."¹⁰²

This sanctuary, which was to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days, she said, was "the New Jerusalem temple, of which Christ is a minister."¹⁰³

Bates referred to Jesus' presence amid the golden candlesticks (Rev 1:12, 14; 2:1) as evidence of the reality of His first-apartment ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.¹⁰⁴

Sanctuary, Decalogue, and Sabbath

The newly developed sanctuary doctrine provided a strong argument for the perpetuity of God's law and drew attention to the obligation of the seventh-day Sabbath. In fact, the only Adventists who adopted the seventh-day Sabbath were those who had accepted the sanctuary theology of Hiram Edson, Ellen White, and Owen R. L. Crosier.

In the study of the sanctuary, interest in last day events naturally focused on the fact that "the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament" (Rev 11:19). Commenting on God's testament, Bates said it represented "the Ten Commandments. Here I understand is where the spirit made an indelible impression to search the Scriptures for the TESTIMONY of God."¹⁰⁵ This, of course, brought out the significance of the Decalogue for the last days.

Commenting on how the sanctuary doctrine led him to accept the Sabbath, Edson related that his "understanding of the opening of the tabernacle of the *testimony* in heaven, and the seeing of the ark of his *testimony*," together with the reading of a pamphlet on the Sabbath, had prompted him to look at the subject of the seventh-day Sabbath.¹⁰⁶

It was felt, therefore, that Revelation 11:19 showed that the heavenly sanctuary, like the earthly sanctuary, contained an ark with the Decalogue in the Most Holy Place. Such a typology provided a frequently used argument of the unchangeable character of the Ten Commandments, including that of the seventh-day Sabbath. Thus James White commented that "if the Ten Commandments are preserved in heaven, certainly they are not abolished on earth."¹⁰⁷ It showed that "God's covenant of commandments is an everlasting covenant, perpetuated and preserved in the Heaven of Heavens. A change of dispensations has not broken, nor altered it."¹⁰⁸

The April 3, 1847, Ellen White heavenly sanctuary vision supported the integral relationship between the sanctuary, the Ten Commandments, and the Sabbath. In relating her vision she wrote that she saw the Holy of Holies of God's heavenly temple which had an ark with tables of stone folded together like a book.

She said "Jesus opened them, and I saw the Ten Commandments written on them with the finger of God. On one table was four, and on the other six. The four on the first table shone brighter than the other six." Then she noticed that "the fourth (the Sabbath commandment) shone above them all; for the Sabbath was set apart to be kept in honor of God's holy name. The holy Sabbath looked glorious—a halo of glory was all around it."

Referring to the perpetuity of the law and the Sabbath, she remarked, "I saw that the Sabbath was not nailed to the cross. If it was, the other nine commandments were; and we are at liberty to go forth and break them all, as well as to break the fourth. I saw that God had not changed the Sabbath, for He never changes."

She added, "And I saw that if God had changed the Sabbath, from the seventh to the first day, He would have changed the writing of the Sabbath commandment, written on the tables of stone, which are now in the ark, in the Most Holy Place of the temple in heaven; and it would read thus: The first day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. But I saw that it read the same as when written on the tables of stone by the finger of God, and delivered to Moses in Sinai, 'But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.'"¹⁰⁹

The Sabbath took on more importance in Ellen White's March 24, 1849, vision. This view showed the role of the sanctuary doctrine in making God's law and the Sabbath a special test for His people since 1844. She related that the vision pointed out that "the time for the commandments of God to shine out, with all their importance, and for God's people to be tried on the Sabbath truth, was when the door was opened in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary, where the ark is, containing the Ten Commandments." It was after Jesus had opened the door in the Most Holy Place, she said, that God's people began to be "tested on the Sabbath question."¹¹⁰

The Sanctuary and Judgment

The study of the sanctuary service brought new insights into the nature of God's final judgment.

A few months after the Disappointment an article in the *Western Midnight Cry* referred to a presently ongoing judgment before the actual Second Advent. It said that there were certain persons who argued that "Christ did on the 'tenth day,' 'come' from His 'Father's throne' to His 'Judgment seat,' where He is now sitting in judgment on our world, Ex. 28:15, 29, 30; Num. 27:18-21; Ex. 30:10; Lev. 16:29-31; Lev. 23:29, 31; Heb. 4:14-16; 5:8; 9:6-12, 19-26; Lev. 9:22-24; Acts 3:19-21."

However, they were not prepared to say "whether the judgment has yet set upon the 'living.'" To support the idea that "the judgment must set before Christ personally appears to 'execute judgment,'" the following texts were cited: *Revelation 11:15-18; 20:12; Matthew 5:25; Daniel 7:9-10; Ezekiel 21:30; Isaiah 11:3-4; Psalms 98:8-9; 50:3-5; 82:8; 96:11-13; 76:8; 2:7-9; Revelation 4:1-6; 20:11; 14:14; 1 Thessalonians 4:16-17.*¹¹¹

One of the earliest attempts to relate the sanctuary directly to the judgment was done through "the breastplate of judgment" concept.¹¹² By using the typological principle, several interpreters applied *Exodus 28:29* ("And Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel in the breastplate of judgment upon his heart, when he goeth in unto the holy place for a memorial before the Lord continually") to Christ's high priestly ministry. They reasoned that in harmony with the type, Christ, carrying the breastplate of judgment with the names of all God's faithful people, had entered the Most Holy Place in 1844. Crosier explained that in this manner the high priest "may bear their judgment."¹¹³

Another Adventist applied the breastplate of judgment concept in a preadvent judgment setting to *Daniel 12:13*. In speaking of "Daniel standing in his lot in the judgment, I would be understood as saying, that when our great High Priest entered the Most Holy Place with the names of all Israel inscribed upon his breastplate, Daniel was judged worthy or unworthy to be thus borne before the Father. This is what I understand by the dead standing before God in the judgment."¹¹⁴

Bates felt that the judgment scene of *Daniel 7* and the judgment-hour message of *Revelation 14* were simply references about the nature of Christ's post-1844 ministry. He noted that in harmony with *Daniel 7:9-10, 13* and *Revelation 14:6-7* both the Father and the Son had moved to the Second Apartment of the heavenly sanctuary "to set [sic] in judgment."¹¹⁵

This judgment he saw as twofold: (1) "To decide who is, and who is not worthy to enter the gates of the Holy City; while the Bridegroom, High Priest, Mediator and crowned King of Israel stands before Him advocating the cause of all presented on His breastplate of judgment. As Daniel sees it, the judgment is now set and the books open." (2) Upon completion "comes the day of judgment, ... and perdition of ungodly men."¹¹⁶ The first phase is a judgment on God's people, the second on the wicked.

The Sanctuary and Sealing

By 1849 the seventh-day Sabbath was interpreted as "the seal of the living God." The cry of the third angel of *Revelation 14* with its emphasis on the commandments of God (*Rev 14:12*) constituted the sealing message.¹¹⁷ This message called people to observe God's law—including the Sabbath—and was equated with "present truth." Believers were living in the "sealing time,"¹¹⁸ a period that would last until the end of Christ's sanctuary ministry. At that point His people would be sealed with "the seal of the living God" for protection against the "burning wrath of God, in the seven last plagues."¹¹⁹

Bates expected 144,000 to be sealed. He said that at the mercy seat before the Father's throne, Christ as priest and king presented on His breastplate the 144,000 to be sealed (*Rev 7*), "pleading with him to blot out their sins, and send the holy spirit of promise to seal them with the seal of the living God."¹²⁰

God first had to try the believers, said Bates. He "humbled them, to prove them, to know what is in their hearts, whether they will keep his commandments," especially the Sabbath.¹²¹ In addition, they had to have an experiential knowledge of self-denial and suffering for Christ.

Ellen White remarked that God "gave His people a bitter cup to drink, to purify and cleanse them."¹²² Recent converts who had not experienced the trial of the Disappointment, she said, "would have to know what it was to suffer for Christ's sake." They therefore had to pass through trials "that they may be purified and fitted through suffering to receive the seal of the living God."¹²³

Thus the sealing was not only a present but also a future reality for the believers. During the present sealing time they were being, or about to be, sealed; while at any time Christ could finish His heavenly ministry, indicating the completion of the sealing.¹²⁴

The Sanctuary and Salvation

After the Disappointment many Millerites were under the conviction that the door of *Matthew 25:10* shut and human probation closed. James White and others thought that the "atonement ended" on October 22, 1844.¹²⁵ But the sanctuary doctrine was to be instrumental in broadening these limited horizons. From his study of the sanctuary, Crosier concluded that the atonement was not ended. The atonement, he said, "is not yet finished; but we are in the Antitype of the tenth day of atonement."¹²⁶ Eventually White accepted the idea of the continuation of Christ's atonement.¹²⁷

Initially, most of those who had adopted the newly developed sanctuary doctrine assumed that the change in Christ's heavenly sanctuary ministry affected His mediatorial relationship to the world. In 1847 James White wrote that "from the ascension, to the shutting of the door [*Matt 25:10*] Oct. 10, 1844, Jesus stood with wide-spread arms of love, and mercy; ready to receive, and plead the cause of every sinner, who would come to God by Him." But on October 22, 1844 said he, Christ "passed into the Holy of Holies, where He has since been a merciful 'high priest over the house of God.'"¹²⁸

At the same time Bates recommended the visions of Ellen White as comfort and strength for God's "scattered," "torn," and "pealed people," since the closing up of our work for the world in October, 1844.¹²⁹ Although he refused to say that the "door of mercy" was closed, he nevertheless commented that there was "no more mediation for the world" because the mystery of God was finished (*Rev 10:7*).¹³⁰

In 1849 Ellen White had a vision revealing a shut-door episode in Christ's sanctuary ministry in 1844. In paraphrasing *Revelation 3:7-8*, she stated that "Jesus had shut the door in the Holy Place, and no man can open it; and that he had opened the door in the Most Holy, and no man can shut it."¹³¹ This interpretation of *Revelation 3* was "entirely new" to her.¹³² and inaugurated a development away from the shut door of *Matthew 25:10*.

The application was used immediately by others. David Arnold remarked that "Christ our great high priest has finished his daily ministration in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary, for the Gentile world, clothed himself in the holy garments, and *shut the door* of the holy place, opened the door of the Most Holy Place" to serve as a "merciful high priest over the household of faith."¹³³

In the few years immediately following the Disappointment, therefore, the pioneers saw Christ's mediatorial work as pertaining only to the "household of faith," the "true Israel of God," and the "house of God." Arnold employed the breastplate of judgment concept to show why mercy was still available to God's people. In harmony with the type, said he, Christ "clothes Himself in the holy garments, having on the breastplate of judgment, on which [are] inscribed the names of the true Israel of God."¹³⁴

Arnold also included among those entitled to divine mercy all who had passed the "line of accountability" after the Disappointment. Since they were on October 22 in "a state of INNOCENCY, they were entitled to a record upon the breastplate of judgment as much as those who had sinned and received pardon; and are therefore subjects of the present intercession of our great high priest."¹³⁵

According to Edson the names on the breastplate incorporated all who "have not sinned willfully." These even included those "who had a sacred reverence for God, and his words and his fear before their eyes, yet they made no profession of religion or of conversions." They could "repent and find forgiveness."¹³⁶

In addition Edson noted from an analysis of the sacrifices offered on the Day of Atonement that besides the blotting out of sins there was on that day an opportunity for forgiveness of sins. "In the type, on the tenth day of the seventh month," he said, "the daily, the morning and evening sacrifice, and other offerings for the forgiveness of sins were kept up. See *Num 36:7-11*."¹³⁷

This implied the possibility for forgiveness during the antitypical day for those who "had not had the light on the Second Advent doctrine, and had not rejected it, but were living according to the best light they had."¹³⁸ On the other hand there was no possibility for conversion of those who had been accountable for their actions at that time and had rejected the Second Advent message.

Similarly, James White commented that the sinner who had "rejected the offer of salvation" was left "without an advocate, when Jesus passed from the Holy Place, and shut that door in 1844." Also rejected, said he, was the "professed church, who rejected the truth."¹³⁹ Bates expected only 144,000 persons to be saved throughout the world.¹⁴⁰

The Early Adventists anticipated that when Christ had completed His Second Apartment ministry (in the very near future) all mediatorial work would be terminated. Ellen White remarked that Jesus was still "interceding for Israel" in the Most Holy Place and would not leave it "until every case was decided either for salvation or destruction."¹⁴¹ For encouragement she stressed that "Jesus is still in His Holy Temple, and will now accept our sacrifice, our prayers, and our confessions of faults and sins, and will now pardon all transgressions of Israel, that they may be blotted out before he leaves the Sanctuary."¹⁴²

Ellen White's November 1848 vision revealed that upon completion of His work in the sanctuary Christ would cease "to plead for Israel" and would come to "the door of the tabernacle or door of the first apartment and confess the sins of Israel upon the head of the scapegoat."¹⁴³ This event marks the close of human probation because there would be no "intercessor" in the sanctuary. Said she, "we had no mediator between God and man."¹⁴⁴

The following year she referred to *Revelation 22:11* to illustrate the condition of mankind when Christ would step out "from between the Father and man" and leave the sanctuary. Then all the sins of God's people would have been blotted out and they would have been sealed with the seal of the living God. But "those that are unjust and filthy, will be unjust and filthy still; for then there will be no Priest in the sanctuary to offer their sacrifices, their confessions, and their prayers before the Father's throne."¹⁴⁵

Ellen White was greatly concerned about the unpreparedness of God's people to live without a mediator. She wrote that "many do not realize what they must be in order to live in the sight of the Lord without a high priest in the sanctuary through the time of trouble. Those who receive the seal of the living God and are protected in the time of trouble must reflect the image of Jesus fully."¹⁴⁶

After the scapegoat ceremony Christ would exchange His priestly attire for the garments of vengeance. Then "God will keep silent no longer; but pour out his wrath on those who have rejected his truth" and "the seven last plagues will be poured out."¹⁴⁷ During that time God would protect His people.¹⁴⁸ The Second Advent would take place at the conclusion of these plagues.

The heavenly sanctuary service thus played a vital role in the salvation of the human race; but according to James White its function was not to last forever. When Christ has redeemed His people "there will be no more use for the New Jerusalem temple, than there was for the Temple at Old Jerusalem, after Jesus had nailed the ceremonial law to the cross." As evidence for his conclusion White cited John's vision of the Holy City at the close of the millennium and his exclamation, "I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it."—*Rev. 21:22*.¹⁴⁹

Contrasts With Contemporary Views

The newly developed sanctuary views differed substantially from those held by contemporaries. The Sabbatarian Adventist pioneers were well aware of these differences. In the way they replied to their opponents one gets further insight into the dynamics of their sanctuary doctrine.

1. Jesus' ministry in the Most Holy Place. The generally accepted view held that Jesus Christ began His high priestly ministry in the Most Holy Place which in turn was associated with heaven.

Its advocates pointed to the fact that Christ took His place at the right hand of God who was assumed to dwell in the Most Holy Place. Furthermore, Christ ministered "within the veil," an expression taken to mean the veil separating the holy place from the Most Holy Place.

A. At the right hand of God. The argument that at the ascension Christ took His place at the right hand of God in the Most Holy Place James White saw as quite literalistic. He remarked, "No one will contend that Jesus has been perfectly stationary, at the Father's right hand literally, for more than 1800 years."

"In the typical sanctuary," he said, "God manifested His glory in the holy, as well as in the Most Holy. So in the heavenly sanctuary, Jesus can 'appear in the presence of God for us' [*Heb 9:24*] in the holy place, as well as in the Most Holy." Thus he pointed out that "God's throne is above the cherubim, and His glory can be seen from either side of the second veil."¹⁵⁰

Ellen White's 1845 vision showed God's presence both in the holy place and the Most Holy Place and revealed the presence of thrones in both.¹⁵¹ Bates advocated a similar view¹⁵² and noted that the Book of Revelation, written toward the end of the first century, pictured Jesus ministering in the holy place.¹⁵³

B. "Within the veil". The expression "within the veil" (*Heb 6:19*) was interpreted by contemporaries as a reference to the veil before the Holy of Holies, implying that Christ had been in that place ever since the beginning of His high priestly ministry.

Crosier felt that this was not the correct exegesis of this passage. He argued that "the veil which divides between the holy and the Holy of Holies is 'the second veil' [*Heb.*, ch. 9:3; hence there are two veils, and that in ch. 6, being the first of which he speaks, must be the *first* veil, which hung before the Holy, and in Ex. was called a curtain]."¹⁵⁴

When Christ, therefore, "entered his tabernacle, of course the Holy, as that was the first apartment; and our hope, as an anchor of the soul, enters within the veil, i.e. the atonement of both apartments, including both the forgiveness and the blotting out of sins."¹⁵⁵ Those who taught that Christ had been in the Holy of Holies since the Ascension, he said, must also believe that the "atonement of the gospel dispensation is the antitype of the [Day of Atonement]." This meant that the sanctuary of the new covenant had been cleansed in the early part of the Christian era.¹⁵⁶

On April 3, 1847, Ellen White had a vision showing the heavenly sanctuary with two veils; the first veil hanging before the holy place, the second before the Holy of Holies.¹⁵⁷ Two years later, in another vision, she saw that in 1844 Jesus "opened the door into the Most Holy, and passed within the second veil, where He now stands by the ark."¹⁵⁸

2. Scapegoat, another representation of Jesus. Many Christians viewed the scapegoat in the Day of Atonement ritual as another symbol of Christ. Crosier strongly opposed this interpretation. The correct biblical meaning of the scapegoat designates it as a type of Satan.

His arguments were, "1st, That goat was not sent away till after the high priest had *made an end* of cleansing the sanctuary, *Lev. 16:20, 21*; hence that event cannot meet its antitype till after the end of the 2300 days. 2d, It was sent away from Israel into the wilderness, a land not inhabited, to receive them. If our blessed Saviour is its antitype, He also must be sent away, not His body alone, but soul and body, for the goat was sent away alive, from, not to nor into, His people; neither into heaven, for that is not a wilderness or land not inhabited. 3d, It received and retained all the iniquities of Israel; but when Christ appears the second time He will be 'without sin.' 4th, The goat received the iniquities from the hand of the priest and he *sent it away*. As Christ is the Priest, the goat must be something else besides Himself and which He can *send away*. 5th, This was one of the two goats chosen for that day, one was the Lord's and offered for a sin-offering; but the other was not called the Lord's, neither offered as a sacrifice. Its only office was to receive the iniquities for the priest after he had cleansed the sanctuary for them, and bear them into a land not inhabited, leaving the sanctuary, priest and people behind and free from their iniquities. *Lev. 16:7-10, 22*. 6th, The Hebrew name of the scape-goat, as will be seen from the margin of ver. 8, is 'Azazel.' On this verse, Wm. Jenks, in his Comp. Com. [*The Comprehensive Commentary on the Holy Bible* ... 1835] has the following remarks: 'Scapegoat... See diff. opin. in Bochart. Spencer, after the *oldest* opinion of the Hebrews and Christians, thinks Azazel is the name of the devil; and so Rosenmire [Rosenmiller], whom see. The Syriac has Azzael [sic], the angel (Strong-one) who revolted.' 7th, At the appearing of Christ, as taught from *Rev. 20*: Satan is to be bound and cast into the bottomless pit, which act and place are significantly symbolized by the ancient high priest sending the scape-goat into a separate and uninhabited wilderness. 8th, Thus we have [in] the Scripture the definition of the name in two ancient languages both spoken at the same time, & the oldest opinion of the Christians in favor of regarding the scapegoat as a type of *Satan*."¹⁵⁹

Chapter III
Continued Clarification
(1850–1863)

P. Gerard Damsteegt

Sanctuary Polemics

Editorial Synopsis. As the sanctuary doctrine emerged in its broad outlines, uniting Sabbatarians in a common faith, other Millerite groups challenged it. However, the polemics served only to deepen and widen the study of its advocates and clarify the doctrine on a sound biblical base.

Criticisms urged against the doctrine of the sanctuary in recent years reflect to a large degree the same challenges Sabbatarian Adventists discussed with their opponents. With some modification the biblical arguments and reasonings of our pioneers remain valid to this day. To grasp something of the scope of their studies we summarize a number of the major issues under three headings—Prophecy, Sanctuary, and Priesthood:

Prophecy

1. Connection between the 70 weeks and the 2300 days ([Dan 8 and 9](#)).
2. Accuracy of 457 B.C., the beginning date of the 2300 day prophecy.
3. Identity of the little horn ([Dan 8](#)).
4. Meaning of [Daniel 8:14](#) in its context.

Sanctuary

1. Identity of the sanctuary ([Dan 8:14](#)).
2. Nature of the temple/sanctuary in heaven.
3. Most Holy Place (in earthly sanctuary). Is it only a symbol of heaven?
4. Hebrews' use of the term *ta hagia* (holy places). How should it be translated and interpreted?
5. Is the heavenly sanctuary cleansed prior to Christ's ministry?
6. [Hebrews 9:8](#). Does it teach that the first apartment met its antitype in the Mosaic Age; and the Second Apartment in Christ's ministry in heaven in the Christian Age?

Priesthood

1. Did Christ begin His priestly ministry in the Most Holy Place upon His ascension?
2. Christ sits at the right hand of God. Is this evidence of a Most Holy Place ministry only?
3. Does Christ have a one-phased or a two-phased ministry in the heavenly sanctuary?

Although a sprinkling of authors discussed aspects of these and related issues in the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, the dominant writers on the subject were the trio: James White, Uriah Smith, and John N. Andrews. The following section reviews mainly the biblical study and reasoning of Andrews as he presented the doctrine to the readers of the *Review* and addressed the mounting criticism from other Millerites.

Section Outline

- I. Introduction
- II. J. N. Andrews' 1853 Sanctuary Exposition
- III. Reply to the Advent Herald

Introduction

During the years leading up to the official organization of the Sabbatarian Adventists into the Seventh-day Adventist Church (1863) many articles and several booklets were published on the sanctuary topic. Most were written against a background of polemics with other Adventists and their publications. Two major groups opposed the Sabbatarian interpretations. Both continued to associate the sanctuary ([Dan 8:14](#)) with the earth or a part of it, or with the church. Since its cleansing would take place at the Second Advent, it is no surprise that they were constantly involved in attempts to determine the time of that event.

The *Advent Herald* represented the first group. Due to its inability to explain the 1844 disappointment, the *Herald* moved away from the original landmarks of the Second Advent movement. It questioned the relationship between [Daniel 8 and 9](#) and denied any connection between the 70 weeks and the 2300 days¹—a connection referred to by some as “Father Miller’s key.”²

Such a radical position, of course, raised the question whether the 2300 days still had any significance. As Uriah Smith wrote, “Just none at all; as no one can tell where they commence, or where they end; hence they become totally useless, a mere dead letter.”³

The *World’s Crisis* publication represented a second group of Adventists. These Millerites affirmed the relationship between the 70 weeks and the 2300 days. However, they believed that the mistake was due to an incorrect dating of the beginning of the 70 weeks and 2300 days. Therefore, they removed “the starting point, so as to bring their termination to some point in the future,” enabling them to set another time for the Second Advent.⁴

Besides these two publications there were others with whom the Sabbatarian Adventists had little to do in regard to the sanctuary doctrine. One of these was the *Advent Watchman* which according to Smith had “professedly no position.” He remarked that “it has given up the past, rejects the light on the sanctuary, and consequently cannot tell the inquiring traveler where he now stands.”⁵

Finally there was the *Adventist Harbinger* which, as Smith said, had so far “drawn back and apostatized, that it openly renounces all connection with the Advent faith. Point after point it has given up till the whole harmonious theory is finally rejected.”⁶ Presently, he said, it had adopted “a belief in a future age and temporal reign of Christ on earth” while the man of sin was not to be destroyed at the Second Advent.⁷

In this period, because of its importance to the growing Sabbatarian Adventist movement, the sanctuary doctrine assumed a central place. James White asserted, “It lies at the foundation of our faith and hope.”⁸ The *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, the combined church and missionary paper of Sabbatarian Adventists, published several major articles on the sanctuary. The first, an extensive four-part article, was written by J. N. Andrews in 1852–1853. Others were written by Uriah Smith (1854) and James White (1863). Both Andrews’ and Smith’s articles were widely distributed in pamphlet form.

Andrews' 1853 Sanctuary Exposition

Andrews' series was by far the most important and influential one of this period. In stressing the significance of the article, James White stated that it "explains the disappointment of the Advent people, and harmonizes the position of those among them who are still waiting for the Lord, with their past experience in the Advent faith."⁹ Elder Andrews wrote at a time when the Millerite journal, *Advent Herald*, began to deny the connection between Daniel 8 and 9. At the same time some Adventists questioned the identity of the little horn as Rome rather than as Antiochus Epiphanes. There was also the problem of how the identity of the sanctuary in Daniel 8:14 with the heavenly sanctuary harmonized with the context. Finally, one had to relate a two-phased ministry to the general belief that Christ had already been ministering in the Holy of Holies since His ascension.

The article was written in response to these questions while at the same time providing a solution for the disappointment of 1844. In discussing this article and subsequent publications it is not our purpose to repeat the arguments used earlier in defense of the sanctuary doctrine. Rather, we will attempt to bring out new arguments and emphases not previously used to support it.

The Sanctuary in End-Time Prophecy

Daniel 8 and 9 relationships. Andrews begins his study with a traditional Millerite exposition of Daniel 8 to confirm the end-time prophetic context and foundation of the sanctuary doctrine. He demonstrates why the little horn could not be Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but has to represent Rome. The time period, therefore, should not be interpreted as literal but as symbolic days just as the beasts and horns are treated as symbols.

The key to understanding the unexplained portions of chapter 8 (2300 days and sanctuary) Andrews saw in Daniel 9, "the inspired commentary on Dan. 8."¹⁰ He noticed especially in 9:21–27 the internal evidence for a relationship with Daniel 8. He argued that here in this passage Gabriel gave the prophet insight into the previously unexplained portions of the vision in chapter 8, pointing out that the 70 weeks were "cut off" from the 2300 days.¹¹

The contextual relationship between Daniel 8 and 9 was crucial. Andrews concurred with Apollos Hale that this linkage was one of "the main pillars in our system of interpretation so far as prophetic times are concerned. If the connection between the 70 weeks of Dan. 9, and the 2300 days of Dan. 8, does not exist, the whole system is shaken to its foundations."¹²

In the article Andrews provided historical evidence for the accuracy of the dates for the 70 week prophecy, such as the year 457 B.C. (the 7th year of Artaxerxes), A.D. 27 (the beginning of Christ's ministry), and A.D. 31 (the crucifixion date).¹³ The decree "to restore and to build Jerusalem" marked the beginning of the 70 weeks. It was clear that the decree given to Ezra in the seventh year of Artaxerxes (not the permission granted to Nehemiah in the twentieth year of the same king) fulfilled the prediction.¹⁴

Little Horn (Dan 8:14). Andrews identified the little horn in harmony with the Millerite position as Satan's two persecuting powers or "desolations": paganism and papacy. These powers, accordingly, represented "the two grand forms of opposition, by which Satan has desolated the church, and trod under foot the sanctuary of the living God," throughout the ages.¹⁵

Continuing the Millerite view, he held that the vision set forth two opposing sanctuaries: the sanctuary of Satan (Dan 8:11) and the sanctuary of God (8:13–14). There were also two opposing hosts: Satan's host (8:12), and God's people—the church (8:10, 13), intimately associated with God's sanctuary.¹⁶

The Sanctuary Throughout the Bible

Having identified the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 as God's sanctuary, Andrews discusses at length the biblical view of the sanctuary. First he criticizes the general positions held among the various Adventist groups that the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 was either the church, the earth or Canaan (Palestine).¹⁷ He then argues that "the tabernacle erected by man, as the pattern of the true, embraced, first the tabernacle of Moses, second the temple of Solomon, and, third the temple of Zerubbabel. The true tabernacle of God is the great original of which Moses, Solomon and Zerubbabel erected 'figures,' 'patterns' or 'images'."¹⁸

Although God gave careful instruction for their establishment, Andrews noted that each of these sanctuaries was eventually forsaken by God because of apostasy of the people. Yet God's provision for these typical services with their minute instructions was not in vain. *Hebrews 8–10* revealed the true significance of these sanctuary rituals: "The building itself was but a 'figure of the true,' a 'pattern of things in the heavens' while 'the priests which there ministered, served 'unto the example and shadow of heavenly things,' and the sacrifices there offered, continually pointed forward to the great sacrifice that should be made for the sin of man."¹⁹

Transition From the Earthly to the Heavenly Sanctuary

Hebreaus and the Gospels provide ample evidence that the typical sanctuary eventually gave place to the heavenly sanctuary. Andrews cited the following arguments as "conclusive evidence" of this transition:

1. The sanctuary of the first covenant ends with that covenant, and does not constitute the sanctuary of the new covenant. *Heb. 9:1–2, 8–9; Acts 7:48–49.*
2. That sanctuary was a figure for the time then present, or for that dispensation. *Heb. 9:9.* That is, God did not, during the typical dispensation, lay open the true tabernacle; but gave to the people a figure or pattern of it.
3. When the work of the first tabernacle was accomplished, the way of the temple of God in heaven was laid open. *Heb. 9:8; Ps. 11:4; Jer. 17:12.*
4. The typical sanctuary and the carnal ordinances connected with it, were to last only till the time of reformation. And when that time arrived, Christ came, an high priest of good things to come by a greater and more perfect tabernacle. *Heb. 9:9–12.*
5. The rending of the vail of the earthly sanctuary at the death of our Saviour evinced that its services were finished. *Matt. 27:50–51; Mark 15:38; Luke 23:45.*
6. Christ solemnly declared that it was left desolate. *Matt. 23:37–38; Luke 13:34–35.*
7. The sanctuary is connected with the host. *Dan. 8:13.* And the host, which is the true church, has had neither sanctuary nor priesthood in Old Jerusalem the past 1800 years, but has had both in heaven. *Heb. 8:1–6.*
8. While the typical sanctuary was standing, it was evidence that the way into the true sanctuary was not laid open. But when its services were abolished, the tabernacle in heaven, of which it was a figure, took its place. *Heb. 10:1–9; 9:6–12.*
9. The holy places made with hands, the figures or patterns of things in the heavens, have been superceded by the heavenly holy places themselves. *Heb. 9:23–24.*
10. The sanctuary, since the commencement of Christ's priesthood, is the true tabernacle of God in heaven. This is plainly stated in *Heb. 8:1–6.* These points are conclusive evidence that the worldly sanctuary of the first covenant has given place to the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant.²⁰

Old Testament evidence for this transition could also be seen in statements made by the angel Gabriel (Dan 9). The angel explained that 70 weeks of the 2300 days belonged to the "Jews, the professed people of God in the time of the first covenant." Gabriel foretold that "the earthly sanctuary [would] be destroyed, shortly after their rejection of the Messiah, and never be rebuilt, but be desolate till the consummation" (9:26–27).²¹

At the same time the angel brought to view the new covenant and its church (9:27), its sacrifice (9:26), and its sanctuary (9:24). "Gabriel informed Daniel that before the close of the 70 weeks, which belonged to the earthly sanctuary, the Most Holy should be anointed." "This 'Most Holy,'" he said, "is the true tabernacle in which the Messiah is to officiate as priest."²²

Andrews saw additional support for the transition from earth to heaven in the type-antitype relationship between the inaugurations of the two sanctuaries. "As the ministration of the earthly tabernacle began with its anointing, so in the more excellent ministry of our great High Priest, the first act, as shown to Daniel, is the anointing of the true tabernacle or sanctuary of which He is a minister. *Ex. 40:9–11; Lev. 8:10–11; Num. 7:1; Dan. 9:24.*"²³

"Holy Places" of the Heavenly Sanctuary

In the final section of his four-part article Andrews dealt with the nature of the heavenly sanctuary and its services. He argued that the heavenly sanctuary had two holy places. Expanding Crosier's argument, he reasoned that the tabernacle, consisting of two holy places, was to be "a correct pattern or model" of the building that God showed Moses on mount Sinai (Exod 25:8–9, 40). However, "if the earthly sanctuary consisted of two holy places, and the great original from which it was copied, consisted of only one, instead of likeness, there would be perfect dissimilarity."²⁴

Solomon's temple "was built in every respect according to the pattern which God gave to David by the Spirit [1 Chr 28:10–19]." The king is supposed to have prayed, "Thou hast commanded me to build a temple upon thy holy mount, and an altar in the city wherein thou dwellest, a resemblance of the holy tabernacle which thou hast prepared from the beginning" *Wis. Sol. 9:8.* Andrews observed that although this temple was built on a larger scale than the tabernacle, its distinguishing feature consisted in the fact that it was composed of two holy places, revealing "clear proof that the heavenly tabernacle contains the same."²⁵

Citing *Hebrews 9:23–24*, Andrews pointed out that Paul plainly states that "the holy places [plural] made with hands" are the figures [plural] of the true. And that the tabernacle, and its vessels, are 'patterns of things in the heavens.' This, he noted, was "direct evidence that, in the greater and more perfect tabernacle, there are two holy places, even as in the 'figure,' 'example' or 'pattern'."²⁶

Andrews commented that when Hebrews mentioned the heavenly sanctuary it used the word "holies [plural]" in *Hebrews 8:2; 9:8; 10:19.* It was, therefore, incorrect to refer to the expression "holiest of all" in 9:8 and 10:19 in the KJV as evidence that Christ began His ministry in the Most Holy Place at His ascension. A more accurate rendering of these texts, he said, was given by Macknight—"holies," or the Douai Bible—"the holies."²⁷

Andrews also stated that the Bible described the heavenly sanctuary with furniture similar to that in the earthly sanctuary. There was the "ark of God's testament" (Rev 11:19), the cherubim (Ps 99:1), the golden altar of incense (Rev 8:3; 9:13), the candlestick with the seven lamps (Rev 4:5), and the golden censer (Rev 8:3).²⁸

Relevance of the First Apartment

The priestly ministry in the holy place of the typical sanctuary was important because it foreshadowed Christ's ministry in the true tabernacle. These priestly services, Andrews said, were:

- (1) The daily service consisting of "the regular morning and evening burnt-offering, [Ex. 39:38–43; Num. 28:3–8]"; (2) "the burning of sweet incense upon the golden altar, when the high priest lighted the lamps every morning and evening, [Ex. 30:7–8, 34–36; 31:11]"; (3) "the special work upon the Lord's Sabbaths, and also upon the annual sabbaths, new moons and feasts, [Num. 28:11–31; 29; Lev. 23]"; (4) "the special work for individuals as they should present their particular offerings through the year. *Lev. 1–7.*"²⁹

Transferal of Sin and Guilt

Earthly sanctuary. During the time allotted for the first apartment ministry, the sins of repentant sinners were transferred to sacrificial animals by laying hands upon the head of the victims (Lev 1 and 3). The animals were killed and their blood, "bearing that sin and guilt, was carried into the sanctuary, and sprinkled upon it" (Lev 4). This process completed the transferal of sins to the sanctuary.³⁰

Once a year on the Day of Atonement the transferred sins were removed from the sanctuary by means of an atonement made for (1) "the children of Israel for all their sins" and (2) "the holy sanctuary."³¹ On that day, Andrews says, "in the Most Holy Place, blood was offered for the sins of the people to make an atonement for them" (Lev 16:5, 9, 15, 17, 30, 33, 34) and "the two holy places of the sanctuary, and also the altar of incense were on this day cleansed from the sins of the people, which ... had through the year been borne into the sanctuary and sprinkled upon it" (Lev 16:16, 18–20, 33; Exod 30:10).³²

Heavenly sanctuary. Using typology, Andrews reasoned that just as in "the shadow of the heavenly things" the sin of the sinner was transferred to the sanctuary through the "offering of blood by the high priest, ... so it is in the substance." "He who bore our sins at his death, offers for us his blood in the heavenly sanctuary." And because "the sins of men had been borne into it through the blood of the sin-offering, ... they must be removed" through a similar cleansing process as that of the earthly sanctuary.³³

The implications of the two-fold purpose for the Day of Atonement (the "forgiveness of iniquity" and the "cleansing of the sanctuary")³⁴ were significant for the antitypical day of atonement. This concept affirmed that while the cleansing process continued there was still the possibility for the forgiveness of sins. Andrews declares, "Our High Priest stands by the MERCY-SEAT (top of the ark), and here he offers His blood, not merely for the cleansing of the sanctuary, but also for the pardon of iniquity and transgression."³⁵

Sanctuary and Salvation

The availability of forgiveness for sins on the antitypical day of atonement gave relevance to the concept of the "open door in the heavenly sanctuary, [Rev. 3:7–8; Isa. 22:22–25]." Like James White, Andrews extended an invitation to those "who have not sinned away the day of grace" to come to this open door for "pardon and salvation."³⁶

During this time, he said, "the third angel, with the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, gives this last message of mercy, while our High Priest ministers for us before the ark containing the commandments." At the same time the "host, or church, are waiting the completion of the great work, and putting away of their sins."³⁷

In his concluding remarks Andrews expresses his conviction that the sanctuary would remain forever with God's people. "In the midst of that Paradise of God, where his saints will ever remain, we behold his glorious sanctuary; [Eze. 37; Rev. 21:1–4;] and here we leave it, content, if we may be of the number who shall serve God in that temple, forever and ever.—Rev. 7:13–15."³⁸

Response to Critics

At this point most criticism of the developing doctrine of the sanctuary among the Sabbatarians came from other Adventists. They advocated the view that Christ had ministered, ever since His ascension, in the Most Holy Place. Andrews replied to their arguments as follows:

Anointing of the Most Holy. Some Adventists argued that the expression "to anoint the most Holy" (Dan 9:4) was proof that Christ ministered not in the holy place but in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary.

Andrews rejects this view, stating that "before the Levitical priesthood began to minister in the earthly sanctuary, that entire building, the Holiest as well as the holy place and all the sacred vessels, were anointed. *Ex. 40:9–11; 30:23–29; Lev. 8:10; Num. 7:1.*"³⁹ After the anointing was completed the priestly "ministration began in the first apartment. *Lev. 8–10; Heb. 9:6–7.*" "This order, let it be remembered, was 'the example and shadow of heavenly things.'"⁴⁰

Sitting down at the right hand of God. Others referred to *Hebrews 10:12*—"This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God"—as evidence that Christ did not minister in two holy places.

Andrews replies that "so far as the idea of *sitting down* is concerned, it would be equally proper to represent him as *standing* on the Father's right hand. *Acts 7:56.*" Furthermore, "if the Saviour is at 'the right hand of the power of God' when descending from heaven, as He testifies respecting Himself [Matt. 26:64; Mark 14:62; Luke 22:69], then he certainly can be at the Father's right hand, in both the holy places."⁴¹

Andrews illustrates his point further by referring to *Hebrews 8:2* which shows Christ as a "minister of the sanctuary." He notes that here the word for sanctuary in the original is plural and can be rendered "holies" or "holy places" as in the Douai Bible or the Macknight translation.

From this he concludes that "(1) our Lord *can* be a minister of the two holy places, and yet be at the Father's right hand. (2) He *must* minister in both the holy places, or Paul's language that He is a minister of the holies or holy places [plural,] is not true. An high priest that should minister simply in the holiest of all, is not a minister of the holy places."⁴²

"Into the holiest". The following texts were used to prove that Christ ministered only in the Most Holy Place. "The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing" (Heb 9:8). "Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus" (Heb 10:19).

Andrews felt that these texts could not be used as proof because the original word translated as "Holiest of all" and "Holiest" was the same as the one rendered "sanctuary" in *Hebrews 8:2.* "With a literal rendering of the word, giving it in the plural in our language, just as it was written by Paul ['holy places'], the objection to Christ's ministration in the two holy places of the heavenly sanctuary is entirely removed."⁴³

The expression "the first tabernacle" (Heb 9:8) Andrews interprets as the earthly tabernacle. He paraphrases the text as follows: "The way into the holy places of the heavenly sanctuary was not laid open, while the ministration in the earthly tabernacle continued; but when that ministration was abolished, the way of the heavenly holy places was laid open, and we have boldness to enter by faith, where our High Priest is ministering for us."⁴⁴

Andrews also points out that the Greek word translated "into the holy place" (Heb 9:12, 25) and "into the sanctuary" (Heb 13:11) was the same as in *Hebrews 9:24* where it was "literally rendered in the plural, 'into the holy places.' This means, he concludes, that the heavenly tabernacle where 'Christ ministers, is composed of holy places, as really as was its pattern or image, the earthly tabernacle; and our great High Priest is a minister of those holy places while at the Father's right hand."⁴⁵

Immediately after its publication, Andrews' four-part series was published in pamphlet form and recommended as "the best work that has been published on present truth."⁴⁶

Reply to the Advent Herald

Soon after the publication of the four-part article reviewed above, Andrews returned to the subject. This time, however, he responded to the sanctuary views of the *Advent Herald* and their criticism of Sabbatarian Adventists. Each of these replies provides a rich source of new or more extensive arguments in defense of the sanctuary doctrine. Their positions and their replies are summarized below:

1. **Relationship of the 70 weeks to the 2300 days.** The *Advent Herald* revoked its former Millerite position and began to deny the connection between the 70 weeks and the 2300 days (Dan 8 and 9). In response to their abandonment of this crucial position on the interpretation of Daniel, Andrews prepared the following series of questions to be considered by anyone having doubts about this relationship:

- A. "Was not Gabriel commanded to explain to Daniel that vision in which the period of 2300 days was given?"
- B. "Did not Gabriel on that occasion explain every part of the vision to Daniel, with the exception of the sanctuary and 2300 days?"
- C. "Does not Daniel say, however, at the close of the chapter, that he was 'astonished at the vision but *none* understood it'?"
- D. "If *none* understood it, had Gabriel fulfilled the divine mandate, 'Make this man to *understand* the vision'?"
- E. "Did not that charge still rest upon him, accomplished only in part?"
- F. "Was not Daniel in chapter 9 earnestly seeking God, with reference to the sanctuary?"
- G. "Does not the man Gabriel whom he had seen in the vision of chapter 8, in answer to this prayer, say to Daniel, 'I am now come forth to give thee skill and *understanding*?"
- H. "Does he not then charge him to *understand* the matter, and to *consider* the vision?"
- I. "Is not this a clear and unanswerable testimony, that Gabriel has now come to complete the charge given him in chapter 8, which was, 'Make this man to understand the vision'?"
- J. "Does he not begin his explanation with the subject of time?"
- K. "Is not the phrase, 'Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city,' literally rendered, 'Seventy weeks are *cut off* upon thy people,' &c?"
- L. "Have you not proved this point at length from the testimony of such men as Dr. Gill, Hengstenberg, Gesenius, and many other scholars of high standing, and also from the Septuagint and Vulgate?"
- M. "What are the 70 weeks 'cut off' from?"
- N. "From nothing? or from indefinite space?"
- O. "As the great period of 2300 days had been given in the vision of chapter 8, is it not certain, when Gabriel comes to finish the explanation of that vision, and testifies that 70 weeks are *cut off*, that they are cut off from the only period which had been given, viz: the 2300 days?"
- P. "Is there then the least ground for a reasonable doubt that the 70 weeks are the first 490 days of the 2300?"
- Q. "And as the commencement of the 70 weeks in 457 B.C.—the termination of 69 of them in A.D. 27, of 69 and a half in the Spring of A.D. 31, and of the whole period in the Autumn of A.D. 34—is established beyond all controversy, can there be the least question that 1810 days (the number left after cutting off 490) would extend to the autumn of 1844 and no farther?"
- R. "And is it not true that Gabriel does explain the fact to Daniel, that only 490 of the 2300 days belong to the earthly sanctuary?"
- S. "And does not Gabriel name the anointing of the heavenly sanctuary as the last event of the 70 weeks?"
- T. "Does not the ninth chapter of Hebrews plainly and distinctly testify that about that time, the earthly sanctuary was superceded by the heavenly, even as the Levitical priesthood gave place to that of the order of Melchisedec?"
- U. "If the ninth of Daniel is an appendix and explanation of the eighth, can the conclusion be avoided, that Gabriel did explain the transfer from the earthly sanctuary to the heavenly, and that the 2300 days expired in 1844?"
- V. "If the ninth of Daniel is not an explanation of the eighth, how can the wise at the time of the end, understand the 2300 days, when no starting point for the period has ever been given?"⁴⁷

In stressing the seriousness of this connection, Andrews charges that "whoever wrests from Mr. Miller the view that the 70 weeks are the first 490 days of the 2300, robs him of the great argument by which he aroused the world on time, and without which he would have been unable to effect but little."⁴⁸

2. **Symbolic significance of the Most Holy Place.** Andrews objects to the assertion that only the Most Holy Place symbolized the true tabernacle in heaven, "because the entire building, viz: the two holy places, (and not merely the holiest of all,) is expressly stated to be the pattern of the true tabernacle."

He argues that (1) Both Moses and David build a two-apartment sanctuary according to the "pattern" shown (Exod 25:8–9; 26:33; 1 Chr 28:10–19; 2 Chr 3). (2) Paul testifies that these "holy places were figures [plural] of the true, and patterns of things in the heavens Heb. 9:23–24." (3) The word for "sanctuary" (Heb 8:2) and "Holiest of all" (Heb 9:8; 10:19) "is plural signifying holies, or holy places." This furnishes "incontrovertible testimony that the heavenly sanctuary does not consist merely, of the Holiest of all."⁴⁹

3. **Significance of the ministry in the Most Holy.** Andrews observes that there is no biblical evidence for the view that only the Most Holy ministry represents Christ's sanctuary ministry. It is "expressly stated that the ministration of the priests under the typical dispensation was 'the shadow of good things to come; 'the *example* and *shadow* of heavenly things; ' and that Christ ministers in the greater and more perfect tabernacle, a High Priest of those good things to come (Heb. 8:5; 9:11; 10:1)."⁵⁰

4. **Cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary in A.D. 31.** The *Herald* took the position that, as our High Priest, Christ cleansed the heavenly sanctuary at the commencement of His ministry, before beginning His intercession for us.⁵¹ The argument did not make much sense to Andrews.

Since the ministry in a two-apartment earthly tabernacle is "the *example* and *shadow* of Christ's more excellent ministry, it is a certainty that Christ does not *exactly reverse* the order of that ministration! In other words, as the work of the earthly high priest was *concluded* by the act of cleansing the sanctuary, and placing the sins, thus removed from it, upon the head of the scape-goat, we may not expect our High Priest to *begin* his work in the heavenly tabernacle by that act."

If this is the case, he concludes, "the work in the earthly tabernacle, instead of being the example and shadow of Christ's work, is exactly the reverse of it."⁵² He adds that Paul's commentary on the types show that the "heavenly Tabernacle was to be cleansed for the same reason that the earthly sanctuary had been, viz: because the sins of the people had been borne there. Heb. 9:23–24."⁵³

5. **Literal temple in heaven.** Commenting on the concept that the earthly things were "patterns" of the heavenly (Heb 9:23), the *Advent Herald* stated, "they are not 'patterns' in the sense in which one machine is modeled after another." The word "patterns" was used as "a metaphor." The tabernacle simply typified "heaven, the place where Christ after he had offered himself, was to sit down at the Father's right hand to make intercession for sinners."⁵⁴

Andrews points out that the denial of a literal tabernacle of God in heaven is the "root" of their error about Christ's sanctuary ministry. It marked the point where Sabbatarian Adventists and other Adventists departed from each other.⁵⁵ He admits, "If there is no literal temple in heaven, then the word 'pattern' must be a metaphor, indeed, for it would be hard to construct an edifice, the model of one that did not exist, or so construct a model of heaven itself."⁵⁶

However, he summarizes the biblical evidence (Rev 11:19; 14:17; 15:5; 16:17; Ps 11:4; Heb 9:11–12; 8:1–2) that clearly favors a literal heavenly temple. This meant that when the Bible stated that "Moses made a tabernacle after that pattern, we understand that he actually made it like that building."⁵⁷

6. **Symbolic significance of the two apartments.** The *Advent Herald* argued that Hebrews 9:6–7 ("the priests went *always* into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second, went the high priest alone once *every year*, not without blood") showed that the distinction in time and manner of the service in the two apartments was significant. It wrote, "As the services of each, teach how we may have access to God, the two show that at one time man may approach [God] in a manner different from what he might at a former time." From this the writer inferred that the service in the first apartment "signified the way of approach to God during the period anterior to His [Christ's] death," while "at the death and ascension of Christ was fulfilled the significance of the 'Holiest of all' [Heb. 9:3]."⁵⁸

Andrews perceives this reasoning as "quite consistent with itself," because "if there is no temple of God in heaven, then it is very evident that there can be no literal holy places there, the counterpart of those in the earthly tabernacle."⁵⁹ Thus it is no wonder that the word "patterns" is designated as "a metaphor; or that the two holy places of the earthly tabernacle, are figures of the two dispensations"—the Mosaic dispensation and the gospel or Christian dispensation.⁶⁰

In refuting this argument Andrews repeats his previously published biblical evidence on the existence of a literal two-apartment heavenly sanctuary.

7. **Antitype of the first apartment ministry.** Andrews argues that Hebrews 9:8 ("the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest while as the first tabernacle was yet standing") does not support the idea that the first apartment had its antitype before the death of Christ as the *Herald* suggested.

In Andrews' opinion the text makes it clear that "while the first tabernacle with its two holy places was standing—that is, while the typical dispensation lasted—the way into the greater and more perfect tabernacle was not laid open. But when the typical dispensation ended, and the pattern was superceded by the true tabernacle, the way of the heavenly holy places was laid open, and we have boldness to enter where our High Priest is ministering for us."⁶¹

In addition, Andrews points out the unsoundness of the position: If the first apartment ministry had its antitype before Christ's death, as the two-dispensation concept seems to imply, it involves the "absurdity of making the type and antitype exist parallel with each other."⁶²

8. **Two-apartment ministry and access to God.** Andrews criticizes the position of the *Advent Herald* for employing the concept of differences in access to prove that "the ministration in the first apartment 'signified the way of approach to God' in that dispensation [before the crucifixion]." He reasons that "this would make the ministration in the first apartment typify itself, and also typify the ministration in the Second Apartment; for the ministration in the two apartments was 'the way of approach to God' before the death of Christ."⁶³

He further states that "it is certain that the forgiveness of sins was freely promised in the ministration in the first apartment; and though it is promised in connection with the service in the Second Apartment, yet this was but a part of the object of that ministration." "Its great design," he observes, was "the closing up of the yearly round of service, and the cleansing of the sanctuary."⁶⁴

9. **Christ's entrance into the Most Holy in A.D. 31.** Andrews states that Hebrews 9:11–12 ("Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he *entered* in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us") does *prove* a greater and more perfect tabernacle "than the first tabernacle, with which it is here contrasted."

He sees no evidence in the passage that "Christ entered the Most Holy Place of that tabernacle at His ascension." Neither does the phrase, "obtained 'eternal redemption for us' prove that He had fulfilled the type of the priests' entrance into the Holiest." He affirms that "the act of obtaining redemption for man, was the death of our Lord upon the cross; though men must become partakers of this by coming to God severally through our High Priest" (Heb 9:15; Rom 3:24–25; Gal 4:4–5; Col 1:4; Eph 1:7; Gal 3:1).⁶⁵

10. **Christ's ministry in the Most Holy since A.D. 31.** The *Advent Herald* quoted Hebrews 9:24 as evidence for Christ's ministry in the Most Holy since His ascension. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into *heaven itself* NOW to appear in the presence of God for us."

The writer argued that "the presence of God was symbolized by the cloud over the mercy-seat, between the cherubim in the *inner* tabernacle; consequently when it is affirmed that Christ does *now appear* in the presence of God for us, it affirms that he is where the service of the inner tabernacle signified his presence."⁶⁷

Andrews objects to this interpretation. "If the Holiest were the only apartment of the tabernacle where God manifested His presence and glory, and where that cloud was manifested, perhaps the conclusion of the 'Herald' would be just." However, he states, that was not the case.

"When God entered the tabernacle at the first, his glory filled both holy places. Ex. 40:34–35. So, also, with the temple. 1 Kings 8:10–11; 2 Chron. 5:13–14; 7:1–2. In the door of the first apartment, the cloud, symbolizing the divine presence, met with Moses, Aaron, Joshua and Israel. Ex. 33:9–11; Deut. 31:14–15; Num. 12:5. And it was in the daily ministration that God promised to meet with Israel at the door of the tabernacle throughout their generations, and to speak with them there, and to sanctify the tabernacle with his glory. Ex. 39:42–43; 30:36."⁶⁸

Commenting directly on Hebrews 9:24, Andrews writes, "This text first of all implies that Christ has entered into real holy places, of which the earthly holy places were figures." "Read this text with care," he appeals, "and it will save you from believing that the earthly holy places were figures of two dispensations. No, the holy places made with hands are the figures of the true holy places. Or as Macknight renders the sentence, 'Christ hath not entered the holy places made with hands, the images of the true holy places.'"⁶⁹

11. **Antitypical Day of Atonement in A.D. 31.** Andrews rejects the notion that at His ascension Christ became the antitype of the high priest entering the Most Holy Place on the Day of Atonement. He states that Hebrews 9:25–26, which reads, "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," indicates that instead of the Second Apartment or Day of Atonement ministry, "it is the yearly round of ministration in both apartments that Paul here places in contrast with the work of Christ in the true tabernacle."⁷⁰

Andrews observes that in 9:24 the holy places were contrasted with the true holy places, but in 9:25 the work in the typical tabernacle is contrasted with the work of the true, while the same word "holy places" is used (see Macknight and Douai Bibles). Thus, he argues, "it is the yearly round in the two holy places, as in chapter 10:1, and not the work in the holiest, merely, that Paul thus places in contrast with the work of our Lord in the true tabernacle."⁷¹

He reasons that "this shows that the antitype of the work in both the holy places, is to be found in the work of our Lord since His ascension. The two holy places [verse 24] have corresponding holy places in the true tabernacle. The work in the typical holy places [verse 25] has its corresponding work in the true holy places. The work in the earthly tabernacle was repeated once a year. But our great Sacrifice is slain once for all, and once for all completes His round of ministration in the true tabernacle."⁷²

12. **Unfulfilled event of the type since A.D. 31.** The *Advent Herald* advanced the idea that after Christ's ascension the only event in the types yet to be fulfilled was His return.

Andrews affirms that Hebrews 10:14 indicates that Christ "indeed offered the only great Sacrifice which is able to perfect forever those who are sanctified through it."⁷³ However, Hebrews 8:1–2 reveals that while He is at the Father's right hand He is to minister as a great High Priest in the two holy places (Macknight). Furthermore, Hebrews 8:5 shows that "the priests who ministered in the tabernacle which Moses made in all things according to the pattern of the true one, served unto the *example* and *shadow* of Christ's more excellent ministry."⁷⁴

Heb 9:27–28 does not affect this understanding at all. Presently, the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is going on (Heb 9:22–23), and "we are now, with solemn and prayerful interest, looking for Him to appear the second time, who once was slain for us."⁷⁵ He concludes by saying that Christ's work in the Second Apartment "will finish the great work of man's salvation, and the vials of the wrath of God will follow, to desolate a guilty world. Rev. 10:7; 15:5."⁷⁶

13. **Heb 9:8 and the "plural of excellence".** The *Advent Herald* rejected the Sabbatarian concept of a two-apartment heavenly sanctuary. In support of their position, they cited a correspondent of their journal. This gentleman argued that "to build a hypothesis" on the use of the "plural of *hagion*" employed in some cases in the book of Hebrews would "appear ridiculous to anyone who is at all familiar with Hebrew, or with any of its cognate dialects, as Chaldaic or Syriac."⁷⁷ The reason, he said, "is that 'the Hebrew has a *plural of excellence* applied to objects that in their nature are singular."⁷⁸ He affirmed that this practice was followed in the Septuagint and the Greek New Testament. This implied that the plural form for sanctuary in the book of Hebrews in reality referred to a single place and not to holy places.⁷⁹

Andrews replies that this argument is based on the following three steps: (1) "In Hebrew and Greek, a plural of excellence is *sometimes* applied to each of the holy places;" (2) "Therefore the plural used in Heb. 9:8, must be the plural of excellence, and a single apartment is all that is designated;" (3) "That single apartment is *certainly* the holiest."⁸⁰

In evaluating the argument Andrews says that the first fact did by no means "prove" the second and third statements. "All that can be claimed is, that in view of the fact named in the first statement, the second and third might perhaps be true." He felt that both the second and third statements could not be proved but were assumptions. There is no evidence that the plural of Hebrews 9:8 is a plural of excellence indicating a single apartment.

On the contrary, one should notice that "in this text the word is used to designate the antitype of the two holy places, named in the six verses preceding; and that it evidently signifies the same as the greater and more perfect tabernacle named in verse 11." "Hence," he concludes, "there is perfect propriety in believing the whole building of the temple in heaven—the true holy places—is here designated."⁸¹

Christ's Second Apartment Ministry

Editorial Synopsis. In this period Sabbatarian Adventists not only enlarged their understanding of the biblical data on the sanctuary, but continued to answer objections raised against the positions which they were reaching.

In addition they felt obligated to critique unsound views on this topic that surfaced in some Millerite journals. Analyzing contrary views enabled them to clarify their own and to ground the sanctuary doctrine on a scriptural, soundly-reasoned basis.

One strained view argued that the 2300 days/years extended to the antitypical day of atonement, but not to the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. The latter was seen as a later, separate event. The antitypical day of atonement was viewed as probationary time that would last for several years; the cleansing would last for only seven days! Another common view argued that the earth formed the first apartment of the antitypical sanctuary; heaven formed the Second Apartment, and the veil between the two was the sky!

A number of advances in the sanctuary doctrine are taken. We list several:

1. Christ's Second Apartment ministry is to be associated with the judgment message announced by the first angel ([Rev 14:6–7](#)).
2. This judgment must take place before the first resurrection when the reward of eternal life is given.
3. The judgment (carried out by Christ in His Most Holy Place ministry) pertains to those whose names are in the book of life. The judgment sifts out the false, but it provides for the blotting out of the records of the sins of the true followers of God. Sins are forgiven and pardoned when confessed and the believer accepts Christ, but the records of sin are not blotted out until this final judgment and the confessed sins are placed upon the scapegoat—Satan.
4. This judgment—described as “investigative” for the first time—takes place while people are still living on the earth. It begins in 1844 with the righteous dead and comes forward in time. No attempt is made to speculate on when it will pass to the living; but the event was believed to be imminent.
5. The message to the seventh and last church period, Laodicea, is designed by God to prepare the church for this judgment. The meaning of Laodicea, “the judging of the people,” is seen to be especially appropriate for this solemn time of judgment.
6. Sins can be confessed and people can be saved while this judgment is in progress. Christ still ministered as an interceding high priest.
7. The place and role of the scapegoat is further clarified. The pioneers clearly demonstrate why the goat could not symbolize Christ. The goat's part in the sanctuary ritual is not in any saving sense. It symbolizes Satan who stands guilty before God as the originator and instigator of sin.
8. The parable of the wedding garment ([Matt 22](#))—the King's inspection of the guests—is seen to be applicable to the preadvent, investigative judgment.
9. The Hebrew word (*niṣdaq*) in [Daniel 8:14](#) is recognized to carry the nuance “to justify.” In the mind of J. N. Andrews this term makes it evident that [Daniel 8:14](#) is speaking about the removal of sin and iniquity and not the removal of some kind of physical uncleanness. In his mind it serves to link Daniel and Hebrews. “This is an important fact, and one that of itself goes far toward proving that the cleansing of the sanctuary in [Daniel 8](#) and [Hebrews 9](#) are the same.”

Section Outline

- I. Answering Day of Atonement Speculations
- II. Sanctuary and Judgment
- III. Answering New Covenant Sanctuary Speculations
- IV. True Scope of the High Priest's Ministration
- V. Scapegoat and Atonement
- VI. Nature of Sanctuary Cleansing ([Dan 8:14](#))

Answering Day of Atonement Speculations

In 1855 certain Adventists developed the theory that “the 2300 days do not extend to the cleansing of the sanctuary, but to the antitypical day of atonement.” A “preliminary work [was] to be done on that day,” that would continue for several years, “as long as human probation lasts.” Upon completion of this preliminary work the cleansing of the sanctuary would begin and continue for seven days. During this short period, when Christ ministered in the Most Holy Place, there would be no probation.

They saw evidence for the alleged lapse in time between the beginning of the antitypical day of atonement and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, in the various offerings mentioned in [Numbers 29:7–11](#). These special sacrifices, they assumed, were offered prior to the actual cleansing ceremony.⁸²

Andrews observed that this view is incompatible with [Daniel 8:14](#). That prophecy discloses that the 2300 days extends to the cleansing of the sanctuary. The new theory is created by “corrupting” this text and “making it read ‘then shall the antitypical day of atonement commence,’ instead of ‘then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.’”⁸³

As to the special Day of Atonement offerings listed in [Numbers 29](#), he mentions that the Bible is silent on “whether the burnt offerings &c. in question were offered *before* the work in the Holiest or *after* that work.” In fact, they “might have been made *after* the high priest came out of the Holiest, at the time mentioned in [Lev. 16:23–24](#).⁸⁴

Andrews notes that the spring festivals (Passover, Feast of the First Fruits, and the Feast of Weeks) were fulfilled “exactly as to time.” Yet “there was the same work of burnt offerings, &c., on the day of First Fruits, and of the Feast of Weeks, that there was on the Day of Atonement” (see [Lev 23:10–21](#); [Num 28:16–31](#)).⁸⁵

The fulfillment of these types, he argues, “shows us this fact: that the great events for which the Passover, the day of First Fruits, and the Pentecost, were respectively noted, met their antitype on the very days of the types.” Thus, “mere preliminary and circumstantial offerings did not prevent the grand event of the day from meeting its antitype at the time pointed out in the type.”⁸⁶ And if the same kind of reasoning were to be applied to the Day of Atonement, all objections to the beginning of the cleansing of the sanctuary at the end of the 2300 days would be removed.

In this connection Andrews adds an important insight on types and their fulfillment: “The antitype commences on the day of the type, but may extend forward a great distance.” For example “we are still feeding on Christ our passover; we are still keeping the Feast of Unleavened Bread; and the Holy Spirit which came down on the day of Pentecost as the antitype of the feast on that day still abides with the church of Christ” ([1 Cor 5:7–8](#); [John 14:16](#)).⁸⁷

So it will be with “the work in the Holiest on the Day of Atonement. Its antitype must commence at that time, and of course must occupy a space corresponding to its magnitude and importance.”⁸⁸

The notion that the antitype of the preliminary offerings on the Day of Atonement would occupy many years while the cleansing work itself would extend only a few days, Andrews found “absurd.” For 6,000 years the sins of God's people had been brought before God in His sanctuary, but according to this theory the work of removing and blotting out these transgressions would require only seven days!⁸⁹

A year later, C. W. Sperry also commented on this theory and the emphasis placed on the meaning of the preliminary sacrifices on the Day of Atonement. He cautions against a too literalistic view of typology. Although there are many type-antitype relationships, this does not apply in every detail, he argues, because “the law was a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image” ([Heb 10:1](#)).⁹⁰ Therefore one need not conclude that since there was “a preparatory work on the Day of Atonement … there must be in the antitype.”⁹¹

Finally, Andrews strongly objects to the idea that “human probation must close when our Lord enters the Holiest.” He argues that this is not the case in the type nor in the antitype as explained in the NT.⁹² Although “the work in the Holiest was not the offering of blood for particular individuals, but for all the people,” the offerings “like the daily morning and evening sacrifices were offered in behalf of the whole people. So that there is just as much mercy implied in the sin offering in the Holiest as in the other offerings on that day.”⁹³

He explains that the idea that the work in the Most Holy Place was for the purpose of cleansing the sanctuary was but “a part of the truth.” “It was also for the sins of the people. The priest made atonement for the sins of the people on that day just as much as he did for his own sins. Read carefully [Lev. 16](#); [Heb. 9:7](#). And this two-fold work of the high priest seems fitly to typify the two-fold work of our Lord in the Most Holy Place. For the sins of the whole church for 6000 years may be disposed of as individual cases, and all the while that the great work is being accomplished, the blood of Jesus still may avail for us in the presence of God. This would be in accordance with the two-fold character of the type.”⁹⁴

Andrews mentions that the Bible is silent on the hypothetical question, “if the offering of the high priest in the Holiest could avail for a sin committed while he was there before God.” But the fact is, he affirms, the NT shows that “the blood of Jesus avails for us in both the holy places of the heavenly tabernacle. [Heb. 10:19](#), &c. Or as rendered by Macknight: ‘Well then, brethren having boldness in the entrance of the holy places, by the blood of Jesus,’ &c.”⁹⁵

He concludes, saying, “Let either of these translations be correct, the words are a complete refutation of the doctrine that probation closes with our Lord's entrance within the second veil.”⁹⁶

In support of their view that human probation was closed during the Day of Atonement cleansing of the sanctuary, this group of Adventists also argued that in the earthly sanctuary service mercy was available only for those who brought their offerings to the priest at the *door* of the tabernacle. This led to the conclusion that “our prayers and confessions of sins are our offerings and sacrifices; that consequently we can present them nowhere else than at the door of the tabernacle; that we can do this only while our High Priest ministers in the first apartment; and that after his position is changed to the Second Apartment, he will not accept them.”⁹⁷

Smith brushes this argument aside, stating that these individuals did not understand their typology because they “make our prayers and confessions, the antitype of these ancient offerings; and in doing this they betray an enormous misapprehension of the whole subject.” “Christ was the great *antitype* in which these [offerings] all centered,” he affirms. Then he challenges those who “profess such adherence to the type” to show from [Numbers 29:7–11](#) “how many and what kind of confessions answer to ‘one young bullock! one ram! and seven lambs of the first year!’”⁹⁸

First Angel's Message Linked to Second Apartment Ministry

In the 1850s the conviction developed that the judgment was to be associated with the Second Apartment ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. Early references indicate a growing belief that the people of God were being judged.⁹⁹ The major articles on the nature of this sanctuary judgment were written by John N. Loughborough and James White.

Loughborough's article appeared in 1854 in which he describes the cleansing of the sanctuary ([Dan 8:14](#)) as a work of judgment proclaimed by the first angel's message ([Rev 14:6–7](#)). This view he supports with the following arguments:

1. The attire of the high priest worn during the cleansing of the sanctuary. Because the high priest girded himself with the breastplate of judgment for that event he concludes that this "certainly looks as though he [were] going to do a judgment work."¹⁰⁰
2. The cleansing was an atonement for the blotting out of sins. He remarks that he often used the expression, "It is not common to blot out accounts until they are settled;" so our sins are not blotted out until the time of refreshing comes, which is when Jesus leaves the sanctuary, and lays the blotted-out sins on the head of the scape-goat."¹⁰¹
3. The day of cleansing was a day of decision and "those who did not afflict themselves, were to be put to death." Now on the antitypical day of atonement, he reasons, "the third angel is commissioned to perform his work of measuring the temple of God and them that worship in it" with his golden reed ([Rev 11:1](#))—"the commandments of God"—and everyone who "hears distinctly the call and does not obey," is without mercy.¹⁰²
4. "At the end of the days" [1844] Daniel was to "stand in his lot" or "should stand his chance" ([Dan 12:13](#)). This is "because his sins had been confessed, and on the Day of Atonement those sins which have been confessed are opened before-hand to judgment."¹⁰³ These things reveal the judgment on the house of God ([1 Pet 4:17](#)) and indicate "what the judgment is that the first angel of [Rev. 14](#) refers to."¹⁰⁴

Several months later Josiah Litch's position on a preadvent judgment was reprinted. It will be remembered that Litch emphasized the necessity of a trial before the execution of the judgment at the resurrection.¹⁰⁵ The following year Uriah Smith writes that the judgment hour proclamation of the first angel's message refers to "the judgment scene which takes place in the Second Apartment of the sanctuary," and began in 1844. "There was the time when judgment began at the house of God, and the time came when Daniel, and all the righteous in the person of their Advocate should stand in their lot."¹⁰⁶

After quoting [Daniel 7:10](#); [Revelation 20:12](#); [1 Peter 4:17](#), and [1 Timothy 5:24](#), he observes that these texts point to "a judgment of the same nature and can refer to no other work than the closing up of the ministration of the heavenly sanctuary." Hence, "that work must embrace the examination of individual character." He concludes that "the lives of the children of God, not only those who are living, but all who have ever lived, whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life, will during this time pass in final review before the great tribunal."¹⁰⁷

Judgment of Saints Prior to First Resurrection

At the same time, Loughborough, discussing the nature of the resurrection, stresses that "the judgment of the saints must be prior to their resurrection. If we claim otherwise, we have them judged after they are rewarded; for the testimony of Christ is, 'Thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.' According to [1 Peter](#) [chap. 4.] they are judged before the end of all things, or Christ's second coming...."

"We do not understand Peter to testify, that the end of all things was at hand, when he wrote, but, when the end of all things is at hand, Christ is ready to judge the quick (living) and the dead. Verses 17, 18. 'For the time is come (when the end of all things is at hand) that judgment must begin at the house of God....' The above seems to convey the idea that God's people are judged before the wicked, and before the time comes for them to be rewarded."¹⁰⁸

"The last work of Christ while a priest," Loughborough reasons, "is to blot out the transgressions of his people. Of course there can be no condemning them, after His blood has been applied to cancel their transgressions. No! They will be remembered no more against them for ever."¹⁰⁹ If this view is correct, he concludes, "it weighs strongly against the common idea of a general resurrection of both righteous and wicked at the time Christ comes."¹¹⁰

Laodicean Message and the Judgment

In 1856 James White saw great significance in the message to the Laodicean church as applicable to the condition of God's people ([Rev 3:14–20](#)). This gave added support to the belief that the present time was a period of judgment. He remarks, "Laodicea signifies, 'the judging of the people,' or, according to Cruden, 'a just people,' and fitly represents the present state of the church, in the great day of atonement, or judgment of the 'house of God,' while the just and holy law of God is taken as a rule of life."¹¹¹

A few months later E. Everts wrote a letter in which he argues the necessity of a preadvent judgment. "I understand that judgment must be rendered before Christ comes; for when He [Christ] comes it will be to raise the righteous saints, and change the living saints, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; [[1 Cor. 15:52](#)] which, being an instantaneous work, would allow of no time at that moment for judgment." But "judgment must be passed upon all who share in eternal life at the coming of Christ, before He comes, and during the existence of the last generation on earth."¹¹²

Biblical evidence for such a judgment in which "the dead are judged while some are alive" he found in [1 Peter 4:5–6](#): "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick [living] and the dead. For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according [in like manner] to men in the flesh, [living men,] but live according to God, in the Spirit."¹¹³

Everts was one of the first to use the term "investigative judgment." He writes that on the basis of the biblical witness it appears that the "righteous dead have been under investigative judgment."¹¹⁴ "I solemnly believe that the judgment has been going on in the heavenly sanctuary since 1844, and that upon the righteous dead, from 'righteous Abel' down through patriarchs, prophets, martyrs, and all the saints who have fallen asleep in Jesus, judgment has been passing."¹¹⁵

The newly proclaimed Laodicean message he identifies as the antitype of the call to Israel to afflict their souls on the Day of Atonement. He sees its relevance. "We are in the Laodicean or judging-of-the-people condition, and are lukewarm. The appeal of the Faithful and True Witness is a perfect antitypical parallel to that which decided in solemn judgment the fate of the Hebrew church on the tenth day of the seventh month, near the close of all their sanctuary scenes, which shadowed the great decisive judgment in the end of the world. What are they? 'For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people.' [Lev. 23:29](#). Be zealous and repent [afflicted], or I will spue thee out of my mouth [cut thee off from among the people of God]. [Rev. 3:14, 19](#)."¹¹⁶

James White on the Judgment

The most extensive article on this subject was written by James White in 1857. White made a distinction between the judgment of the righteous and the wicked. In each instance their cases were to be investigated before the actual sentence was to be given. As biblical evidence for such a judgment, he gives the following arguments:

1. [First Peter 4:17](#), "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God, and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?" He regards this declaration as a prophetic statement applicable "to the last period of the church" (vss. 5–7, 12–13). It reveals two great classes—the righteous and the sinners—that "will be judged before they are raised from the dead."

"The investigative judgment of the house, or church, of God will take place before the first resurrection; so will the judgment of the wicked take place during the 1000 years of [Rev. 20](#), and they will be raised at the close of that period."¹¹⁷

2. The text "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection" ([Rev 20:6](#)) refers to the righteous and is evidence that their cases will be "decided before Jesus comes to raise them from the dead." As to the time of this judgment, White adds that it will take place "while Jesus offers his blood for the blotting out of sins."¹¹⁸

3. [First Timothy 5:24](#), "Some men's sins [the righteous] are open beforehand, going before to judgment, and some men [the wicked] they follow after," he interprets as meaning that "some men lay open, or confess their sins, and they go to judgment while Jesus' blood can blot them out, and the sins be remembered no more; while sins unconfessed, and unrepented of, will follow, and will stand against the sinner in that great day of judgment of 1000 years."¹¹⁹

4. Further evidence of a preadvent judgment is seen in [1 Peter 4:5](#). From this text, White says, "it appears that the saints are judged while some are living and others are dead."

5. The Day of Atonement he sees as a type of the judgment of God's people. The 2300 days "reached to the cleansing of the sanctuary, or to the great day of atonement in which the sins of all who shall have part in the first resurrection will be blotted out." He adds that the evidence is clear that since 1844 "the judgment of those who died subjects of the grace of God has been going on, while Jesus has been offering his blood for the blotting out of their sins."¹²⁰

Much attention is given to the matter of the blotting out of sins in the judgment. In regard to the time, White argues that this divine act does not take place when sinners are forgiven. Rather, it occurs during "the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary," at "the great day of atonement ... when Jesus offers his blood for the blotting out of sins." He recalls that the "time for blotting out of sins is placed forward just prior to the second appearing of Jesus" according to [Acts 3:19–21](#) and "is evidently the last great work in the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary."¹²¹

The significance of the blotting out process is brought out by the fact that there is a record in heaven of the actions of every "accountable" person ([Rev 20:12](#); [Dan 7:10](#); [Mal 3:16](#)). The book of life contains "the names of all who become the special subjects of divine favor" ([Dan 12:1](#); [Rev 3:5](#); [Phil 4:3](#)). Other divine books contain a record of sins and also "the pardon of sins repented of, and forgiven with those good works necessary to secure favor of God."

These accounts remain "till the time of the judgment of the house of God; till Jesus enters the Most Holy to offer His blood for the blotting out of the forgiven sins of all the just."¹²² Christ is at the right hand of God "ready to plead the cause of every repenting sinner, and through Him sinners may find pardon. He also offers His blood in the Most Holy for the blotting out of the sins of all the just of every age [[Heb 9:13–16](#) quoted]."¹²³

In 1844, he affirms, the great day of atonement began "for the blotting of the sins of all of every age, the cases of patriarchs and prophets, and sleeping saints of all past ages will come up in judgment, the books will be opened, and they will be judged according to the things written in the books."¹²⁴

Thus it is that according to the Scriptures, at the end of the 1335 days in 1844, Daniel stood "in his lot in the decisions of the judgment of the righteous dead." From this he concludes that "the judgment of the righteous dead commenced at that time."¹²⁵

As to the investigative judgment of the living saints, he can not be specific. He says, however, that it is most reasonable to assume that "there is a special call to the remnant, and a special work to be performed by them, and for them, preparatory to the decisions of the judgment in regard to them, and that their salvation depends upon fully obeying the calls and counsel to them." This preparatory call he identifies as the Laodicea message ([Rev 3:14–22](#)).¹²⁶

Those who would have their names retained in the book of life and their sins blotted out, White exhorts, "perfect faith by works, be clothed with the righteousness of Jesus Christ, and get the anointing of the Holy Ghost, which will enable you to see sin in its sinfulness, holiness in its beauty, and the path of life as straight and as narrow as it really is, and retain these priceless treasures, for in this you overcome."¹²⁷

Only through a complete consecration,¹²⁸ will it be possible to have one's sins blotted out and be able to stand in the present judgment. "Very soon will your names either be confessed by Jesus Christ before His Father, or they will be blotted out of the book of life" ([Rev 3:5](#)).¹²⁹

Parable of the Wedding Garment

Uriah Smith alludes to the parable of the wedding garment ([Matt 22](#)) as another evidence for the sanctuary judgment. He interprets it as an illustration of the marriage of the Lamb, taking place "at the close of His ministry as priest, ... when He entered the Most Holy Place."

"By faith" the guests went in to the marriage. The king's coming to see the guests in their wedding garments he associates with "the inspection of our individual cases, as they [come] up for examination before the great tribunal of the heavenly sanctuary."¹³⁰

Answering New Covenant Sanctuary Speculations

In 1856 Uriah Smith published excerpts from an article that held “the antitypical tabernacle to be earth and heaven, with a veil between. Earth the first room or sanctuary. Heaven the second, or holies of holies.” The author suggested that just as the earthly high priest offered his sacrifices in the first room and passed “through the veil into the holy place, so Christ offered Himself in the first room of God’s great tabernacle and has gone within the veil into the second room or heaven itself.”¹³¹

Smith comments that the author has failed to provide any biblical evidence for the earth-heaven symbolism of the sanctuary. He observes that Hebrews reveals the existence of the true sanctuary of the new covenant in heaven and the fact that Moses’ tabernacle was made according to the pattern shown. Then he asks the question, “Can we suppose that the earth was shown him as the pattern of the first apartment, and heaven as that of the second? and if this were so, of what would the golden candlestick, the table of shew bread, and the golden altar of incense be typical? There is no shadow of consistency in such a position and we see not how anyone can ‘grasp’ it.”¹³²

Two years later the *World’s Crisis* argued a position similar to the *Christian Reformer* in which the earthly sanctuary was “the figurative tabernacle” with “heaven being the Holy of Holies, and earth the other part where Christ and His people minister.”¹³³

Smith objects to this view because: (1) “No part of Christ’s ministry can be performed on the earth.” (2) “The antitype of the ancient priestly service, is performed by Christ, and *Him alone*.” He refers to [Hebrews 8:4](#), “for if He [Christ] were on earth, He should *not be a priest*, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law.”

Christ’s ministry, he argues, “is performed entirely and completely in another place.... He performs it independent of, and separate from, His people. There is nothing in the services of Christians which answers to the ancient sanctuary service. They perform no part of the antitypical ministration. Christ is the priest, and they, as suppliants and sinners, seek pardon through his mediation.”¹³⁴

A few years later, in a polemic with Adventists from the *World’s Crisis*, it was again argued that the “new-covenant sanctuary is both heaven and earth.” These Adventists believed that “while the service of the first apartment is being carried out by men on earth, Christ is fulfilling the service of the Most Holy in heaven; and that the blue sky is the vail between the two apartments.”¹³⁵

Loughborough remarks that if this position were true, there would no longer be an “analogy between the work in the typical, and that accomplished in the antitypical sanctuary; for there was to be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation while the high priest went into the Second Apartment to fulfill his work there, and make an atonement. See [Lev. 16:17](#).”¹³⁶

If Christ began the Second Apartment ministry after His ascension, then there would be no first-apartment service. Yet a first-apartment service is necessary, Loughborough argues, because “the priests on earth ‘served to an example of heavenly things.’ [Heb. 8:5](#). Then the service of both apartments was an example, and there must be a service in heaven, answering to the first apartment service on earth.”

He adds that “as the sanctuary is not said to be a pattern of things in earth and heaven, but ‘patterns of things in heaven’ [[Heb. 9:23](#)], both apartments of the antitypical sanctuary must be in heaven.”¹³⁷

James White quotes [Hebrews 8:1–5](#), and [9:22–24](#) as his Scripture base for his argument: “Mark well the words used in these passages to prove that there is a sanctuary in heaven, in the form, at least, of that sanctuary which was on earth. First, ‘examples’; second, ‘shadow’; third, ‘PATTERNS’; fourth, ‘FIGURES.’ Apply these terms to the view that this earth is the holy place, and heaven the Most Holy, and the words at once become vague and senseless.”¹³⁸

True Scope of the High Priest’s Ministration

Adventists connected with the *World’s Crisis* took the position that the typical high priest never ministered in the first apartment of the sanctuary but only in the Most Holy Place. Therefore, Christ fulfills the typical high priest’s role by ministering only one kind of service in the Most Holy Place which ministry He commenced at His ascension.¹³⁹

Loughborough replies that all services in both apartments of the sanctuary were “either directly the service of the high priest, or else accomplished under his superintendence.” “The service of the sanctuary was all the service of the high priest, although the work in the first apartment might in reality have been accomplished by those priests under him, who served in the order of their course.”¹⁴⁰

Scapegoat and Atonement

The phrase that the scapegoat “shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him” ([Lev 16:10](#)) indicated to some that Christ fulfilled the antitype of the scapegoat. Thus the opposing view of Satan as the antitypical scapegoat was misconstrued to mean that “he shares with Christ the honor of making the atonement.”¹⁴¹

To use the word “atonement” in [Leviticus 16:10](#) to prove that the scapegoat symbolized Christ “is certainly a very trivial point to make the fulcrum of so important a question,” Uriah Smith responded. He explains this passage in its context as follows:

1. [Leviticus 16](#) clearly defines the scapegoat’s function, and “any one can judge for himself how much merit there was attached to his office, and how much connection the part he acted had with removing the sins from the children of Israel.”
2. “The only office he performed was to receive the sins of the people from the hands of the priest after he had borne them from the sanctuary, to retain them upon his own head, and go away *from* Israel forever into a land not inhabited.”
3. “Reasoning from type to antitype, we believe the devil will have a similar part to act,” revealing that the “cleansing of the sanctuary being finished, the sins of all those who have escaped his insidious wiles will be laid upon him and he be cast into the bottomless pit.”¹⁴²

Another objection to the identity of Satan as the scapegoat reasoned that sins could be suffered for only once. Thus, the position was “absurd that Satan should suffer for those sins for which Christ has already suffered.”¹⁴³

Smith replies that since the sanctuary services reveal the transferal and removal of sins, “what then is to be done with them, unless they are to be laid upon the head of their old author, the devil?”¹⁴⁴ From the fact that “our sins when forgiven are only transferred through the blood of Christ to the sanctuary,” he concludes, “we learn that the pardon of our sins is only removing from us their guilt, by imputing to us the righteousness of another.”

“But we are not the originators of sin.” “Behind all our transgressions there stands a guilty instigator; and why should it be thought more incredible or unscriptural that the guilt of those sins of which we repent, should be imputed to him who prompted us to commit them, than that the righteousness of Christ, upon our repenting, should be imputed to us?”¹⁴⁵

As to the reason why God has instituted the sanctuary service to eliminate sins instead of making some other arrangement, he cautions, “is not for us to inquire into nor question.” This was part of the “mysteries” of godliness.¹⁴⁶

R. F. Cottrell argues that “the scapegoat had nothing to do in making the atonement.” “The high priest alone made the atonement but he made use of the scapegoat to bear away the sins after the work in the sanctuary was finished.”¹⁴⁷

Nature of Sanctuary Cleansing (Dan 8:14)

In 1856 an article by O. D. Gibson in the *Christian Reformer* prompted a discussion on the nature of the cleansing of the sanctuary. Gibson argued that the earth was the first apartment of God's sanctuary, that is, Christ's kingdom. Thus, the "wicked kingdoms of the earth have trodden under foot the host or people of God ... and also the sanctuary, the place of worship, or offering, which is ... in any and every place under heaven where there is any one of the host to offer praise from a sincere heart."¹⁴⁸ The sanctuary, therefore, was to be cleansed "of those wicked, cruel powers, or governments which have opposed and trodden it under foot with its rightful heirs."¹⁴⁹

Uriah Smith expresses his concern that the article had determined the meaning of the sanctuary from the fact that it was to be trodden under-foot. Rather, he asserts, we should first find the biblical meaning of the sanctuary, and then we can determine the meaning of the treading under-foot. He observes that the expression, "treading under foot," is a figure of speech. "We can as well apply it to a sanctuary in heaven as to one on earth." Since "the Bible speaks of treading under foot the Son of God, the minister of the sanctuary [Heb. 10:27]," he reasons, "to speak of treading underfoot the heavenly sanctuary, in the same sense is both scriptural and reasonable."

To hold that the sanctuary is to be cleansed "of those wicked, cruel powers, or governments," indicates an incorrect understanding of the nature of the sanctuary cleansing. The sanctuary "is cleansed by means of blood, and not by the destruction of the wicked: [Lev. 16; Heb. 9:22–23] it is cleansed of sin, and not of sinners. Sinners are never permitted to inhabit God's sanctuary."¹⁵⁰

At the same time others took note of the Hebrew word translated "cleansed" in *Daniel 8:14*. C. W. Sperry quotes with favor an 1854 *Advent Herald* article which stated that the Hebrew word translated "cleansed" was rendered in the margin as "justified," "the general signification of the word." In view of this root meaning, the article continues, "It thus refers not to a physical cleansing, or purification, but to moral rectitude. That to which it is applied is thenceforth to be held innocent. It is no longer to be held guilty or abominable. Its uprightness is vindicated. Its past guilt is all cancelled. Its sentence is then to be revoked, and all its punishment is remitted."¹⁵¹

Andrews identifies the cleansing of *Daniel 8:14* with that of *Hebrews 9*. He likewise points out that in *Daniel 8:14* the word translated "cleansed" is rendered "justified" in the margin. Hence, it "signifies not the removing of physical uncleanness, but the removing of sin and iniquity. This is an important fact, and one that of itself goes far toward proving that the cleansing of the sanctuary in *Dan. 8* and *Heb. 9* are the same."¹⁵²

In discussing the nature of the cleansing Smith refers to the text, "without shedding of blood is no remission" (*Heb 9:22*). "Remission," he declares, "and not physical uncleanness, is the burden of the Apostle's argument. The sanctuary must be cleansed; the imputed guilt must be removed." Reasoning from type to antitype, he observes that "the heavenly things themselves, of which the earthly were a figure, must be cleansed or purified, but with better sacrifices than those of the type."¹⁵³

Sanctuary and Salvation

Editorial Synopsis. Early on, Sabbatarian Adventists linked the parable of the ten virgins (*Matt 25*) with Christ's marriage to His kingdom in the Most Holy Place (*Dan 7:9–10, 13–14*). The terminology of *Revelation 21* furnished this imagery ("I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife ... that great city, the holy Jerusalem," *Rev 21:9–10*).

By 1851 another passage in *Revelation*, the message to the church of Philadelphia (*Rev 3:7–8*), shed further light on the significance of this parable. James White wrote, "[Christ] closed the work or 'door' of the daily ministration in the holy, and opened the door of the Most Holy. 'The tabernacle of the testimony' [*Rev 11:19*] was then opened; but before this could be done, the 'door,' or work of Christ's continual mediation in the holy had to be closed. This may well be 'likened' to the shut door in the parable."

As study continued, Sabbatarian Adventists eventually recognized that although Christ entered upon His last phase of priestly ministry in 1844, He still interceded in behalf of penitent sinners—and would do so until human probation closed. Some, indeed, had sinned away their day of grace, but the gospel was to sound the invitation everywhere to come to Christ in the heavenly sanctuary for "pardon and salvation." When Christ would leave the sanctuary, the destiny of everyone would then be forever fixed.

Confusion about the meaning and significance of the term "atonement" persisted. Some articles published in the *Review* emphasize that Christ had made a "vicarious atonement" for sinners when He died on the cross, or they would note that the atonement was finished at the cross. On the other hand the well-known pioneer, J. H. Waggoner, rejected such views because (in harmony with Miller) he held that atonement could be made only by a priest; and Christ was not a priest on earth. Therefore, atonement had to be confined to Christ's heavenly sanctuary ministry.

Ellen White's initial "great controversy" vision occurred in 1858. Published that same year, it eventually formed the first of the four volume set, *Spiritual Gifts*. The vision confirmed the Sabbatarian Adventists on the correctness of the positions they had arrived at through Bible study. Further expansion of the topic came through Sabbath School lessons Uriah Smith published in 1862 on the subject of the sanctuary in the book of *Revelation*.

The pioneers attributed general Christian ignorance about Christ's priestly ministry to papal influence that had directed the people away from Christ to a human priesthood on earth. In this manner the papacy trampled down the real ministry of Christ. However, prophecy foretold the breaking out of light from the book of Daniel. Thus, Sabbatarian Adventists believed God was moving to bring the doctrine of the sanctuary to the forefront.

The pioneers saw in the heavenly sanctuary "the grand center of the Christian system." The sanctuary doctrine not only revealed Christ's final priestly ministration, but it also disclosed the unchanging nature of the Ten Commandments and the seventh-day Sabbath. Furthermore, James White affirmed, "We have here [in the doctrine of the sanctuary] a citadel of strength. Here all the great columns of present truth center; and our system of truth forever remains unshaken while this citadel stands."

Section Outline

- I. Shut and Open Doors
- II. Atonement
- III. Ellen G. White: 1858 Vision
- IV. Sanctuary in the Book of Revelation
- V. Ignorance of Christ's Priesthood
- VI. Concluding Summary

Shut and Open Door

In 1851 J. White wrote an extensive article on the parable of the ten virgins. He incorporated new insights from the developing sanctuary doctrine. Thus he compared the wise virgins going to the marriage with believers going by faith into the Most Holy Place, "all that had not rejected light and truth sufficient to be cut off from Israel" because they were carried on the breastplate of Christ the high priest.¹⁵⁴

He saw an illustration of the change in Christ's ministry in the shutting of the door. Referring to [Revelation 3:7-8](#) White says Christ "closed the work or 'door' of the daily ministration in the holy, and opened the door of the Most Holy. 'The tabernacle of the testimony' [Rev 11:19] was then opened; but before this could be done, the 'door,' or work of Christ's continual mediation in the holy had to be closed. This may well be 'likened' to the shut door in the parable.¹⁵⁵ It is the "mediation of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary," he affirms, that prevents the "wrath of God from coming on a guilty world."¹⁵⁶

The following year (1852) James White affirmed that the shut door of [Matthew 25:10](#) "shuts out none of the honest children of God, neither those who have not wickedly rejected the light of truth, and the influence of the Holy Spirit."¹⁵⁷ The mission to these individuals became associated with the invitation, "he that hath an ear, let him hear" ([Rev 3:13](#)).¹⁵⁸

Referring to the open door of [Isaiah 22:22](#) and [Revelation 3:7-8](#), White says, "This OPEN DOOR we teach, and invite those who have an ear to hear, to come to it and find salvation through Jesus Christ. There is an exceeding glory in the view that Jesus has OPENED THE DOOR into the Holiest of all, or has passed within the second veil, and now stands before the Ark containing the Ten Commandments. [[Rev 11:19](#) quoted]."¹⁵⁹

In this context it is no surprise that he states that they had "never felt greater liberty in pointing out the way of life to sinners in past years, than to such now."¹⁶⁰

Describing the present effect of Christ's sanctuary ministry, Andrews notes that "He pleads his blood there for us: it speaks better things than that of Abel; it takes away our sins; it brings pardon, redemption and salvation."¹⁶¹ Through His Second Apartment ministry the human race is not only "pointed to the law in the Most Holy Place in the heavenly tabernacle, which contains the just sentence of death and condemnation, but to the mercy-seat above the law, and to the blood of Christ sprinkled upon it, which can take away sins, and avail for our pardon and forgiveness in the sight of God."¹⁶²

For the early believers the sanctuary doctrine was a source of hope and encouragement in the face of an awesome future. One correspondent writes that those who did not have the true light but lived "according to the best light they had, ... were guiltless; for Jesus stood ready to blot out the errors of His people,"¹⁶³ implying that Christ's present ministry involved the blotting out of sins of ignorance.

Others focused on the need to prepare for the time when there should be no mediator between God and humanity. "If we are found with error then it will sink us down to death." Recognizing the redemptive value of the sanctuary ministry, a correspondent exclaims, "But thanks be to God that we have a Great High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary, who is now standing before the mercy-seat, pleading His blood in our behalf, and now is the time to confess our errors before Him, that our sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord."¹⁶⁴

In 1852 Andrews restated the open-door concept, inviting those who had not "sinned away the day of grace" to come to the heavenly sanctuary for "pardon and salvation."¹⁶⁵ At the same time James White applied the shutting of the door by the Master of the house in [Luke 13:25](#) "to the close of Christ's mediation in the Holiest of the heavenly sanctuary."¹⁶⁶

White concludes that there are in fact two shut doors: "First, when His [Christ's] work closed in the holy place, at the termination of the 2300 days, and, second, when the atonement shall be finished, and Christ leaves the sanctuary."¹⁶⁷ He adds that "the last message of mercy is going forth, and soon the Master of the house will rise up, and shut to the door."¹⁶⁸

When Christ leaves the sanctuary, mankind will have reached the condition described in [Revelation 22:12](#). "Every one's case will be for ever fixed. The holy, who have been benefited by the atonement of Christ, and have been washed from every sin, by His blood, will remain holy, and fit for heaven. The unjust and filthy who have slighted offered mercy—who have neglected to confess their sins—will come up to that point of time, covered all over with unrepented and unconfessed iniquities. In this state," he concludes, "they will remain; for the Master of the house has risen up from His priestly work, and has shut to the door for ever."¹⁶⁹

The time between Christ's entrance into the Most Holy Place and the completion of His ministration there was called "the period of the saints' patience" ([Rev 14:12](#)).¹⁷⁰

The next year Smith invites all "for whom mercy still lingers" to the open door of the sanctuary to receive "pardon of their transgressions."¹⁷¹ He expresses the conviction that "the last great act in the plan of salvation is being accomplished; and the last messenger announcing that mercy yet lingers, is fulfilling his mission. All that could be done for sinful, rebellious man has been done. Life has been freely offered. The Son of God has died to make an atonement for their transgression. Yet a few more days will he plead his blood in the sanctuary in their behalf, ere the work is forever finished."¹⁷²

Atonement

Miller's view that restricted "atonement" to the priest's ministry, excluding the sacrificial act, continued to confuse statements by Sabbatarian Adventists. This can be seen from varying comments in the *Review*.

Cottrell associates Christ's heavenly ministry with the atonement and called the "cleansing of the sanctuary—the last act in the work of atonement."¹⁷³ On the other hand three years earlier Andrews had stated that Christ's death on the cross was to make "an atonement for the transgressors, so they could be pardoned."¹⁷⁴ Others indicate that Christ had made "vicarious atonement at the cross,"¹⁷⁵ or that the atonement was finished at that time.¹⁷⁶ This latter view, however, is rejected by J. H. Waggoner a few years later.¹⁷⁷

In 1855 Zebina Marsh, a correspondent, regarded it still possible to get new names written on Christ's breastplate. "Brethren, 'come over and help us,' so that some souls may have their names written on the breast-plate of judgment before our Mediator leaves the Most Holy Place, and no more mercy can be offered."¹⁷⁸

Throughout the following years the offer of salvation (in the light of Christ's on-going sanctuary ministry and the imminence of His coming) continued to be extended on an ever-widening scope. James White states it succinctly: "While His [Christ's] work as Priest is being finished in heaven, the mystery of God, which is the gospel to the world, is being finished on earth in the third [angel's] message, which is the last that offers salvation."¹⁷⁹

Ellen G. White: 1858 Vision

Toward the close of the 1850s Ellen G. White received a vision of the great controversy between Christ and His angels and Satan and his angels. This vision confirmed the sanctuary doctrine as it had developed up to that time. Some aspects of this vision were a reaffirmation of previous visions; other features had specific relevance to the contemporary polemic among the Adventists and provided additional new details. The following confirmations on the sanctuary doctrine were expressed:

Correctness of Time Calculations

"I saw that they [Millerite Adventists] were correct in their reckoning of the prophetic periods. Prophetic time closed in 1844."¹⁸⁰

Typological Relationship Between Heavenly and Earthly Sanctuaries

Physical reality of a two-apartment heavenly sanctuary. "I was then bid to take notice of the two apartments of the heavenly sanctuary. The curtain, or door, was opened, and I was permitted to enter. In the first apartment I saw the candlestick with seven lamps, which looked rich and glorious; also the table on which was the shew-bread, and the altar of incense, and the censer. All the furniture of this apartment looked like purest gold, and reflected the image of the one who entered that place. The curtain which separated these two apartments looked glorious. It was of different colors and material, with a beautiful border, with figures of gold wrought upon it, representing angels. The veil was lifted, and I looked into the Second Apartment. I saw there an ark which had the appearance of being of the finest gold. As a border around the top of the ark, was most beautiful work representing crowns. It was of fine gold. In the ark were the tables of stone containing the ten commandments. On each end of the ark was a lovely cherub with their wings spread out over it. Their wings were raised on high, and touched each other above the head of Jesus, as he stood by the ark. Their faces were turned towards each other, and they looked downwards to the ark, representing all the angelic host looking with interest at the law of God. Between the cherubim was a golden censer."¹⁸¹

1. Two Apartments. "I was shown a sanctuary upon earth containing two apartments. It resembled the one in heaven. I was told that it was the earthly sanctuary, a figure of the heavenly. The furniture of the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary was like that of the first apartment of the heavenly. The veil was lifted, and I looked into the Holy of Holies, and saw that the furniture was the same as in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary."¹⁸²

2. Similarity in services. "As the priests in the earthly sanctuary entered the Most Holy once a year to cleanse the sanctuary, Jesus entered the Most Holy of the heavenly, at the end of the 2300 days of [Dan. 8](#), in 1844, to make a final atonement for all who could be benefited by his mediation, and to cleanse the sanctuary."¹⁸³

"The priests ministered in both apartments of the earthly. In the first apartment he ministered every day in the year, and entered the Most Holy but once in a year, to cleanse it from the sins which had been conveyed there. I saw that Jesus ministered in both apartments of the heavenly sanctuary."¹⁸⁴

"Through the sacrifices and offerings brought to the earthly sanctuary, the children of Israel were to lay hold of the merits of a Saviour to come. And in the wisdom of God the particulars of this work were given us that we might look back to them, and understand the work of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary."¹⁸⁵

Christ's Activities Since 1844

Christ's entrance within the second veil. "In a flaming chariot he [Jesus] passed within the second veil."¹⁸⁶

Christ gloriously attired with breastplate. In 1844, after completing His ministry in the holy place, she states, "Jesus then clothed himself with precious garments. Around the bottom of his robe was a bell and a pomegranate, a bell and a pomegranate. He had suspended from His shoulders a breastplate of curious work. And as He moved, it glittered like diamonds, magnifying letters which looked like names written, or engraved upon the breastplate.... He was fully attired, with something upon His head which looked like a crown...."¹⁸⁷

Christ as mediator in the Most Holy. "As the prayers of the saints in faith came up to Jesus, and he offered them to His Father, a sweet fragrance arose from the incense. It looked like smoke of most beautiful colors. Above the place where Jesus stood, before the ark, I saw an exceeding bright glory that I could not look upon. It appeared like a throne where God dwelt. As the incense ascended up to the Father, the excellent glory came from the Father's throne to Jesus, and from Jesus it was shed upon those whose prayers had come up like sweet incense. Light and glory poured upon Jesus in rich abundance, and overshadowed the mercy-seat, and the train of the glory filled the temple."¹⁸⁸

"I saw the incense in the censer smoke as Jesus offered their [the remnant who followed Jesus into the Most Holy] confessions and prayers to His Father. And as it ascended, a bright light rested upon Jesus, and upon the mercy-seat; and the earnest, praying ones, who were troubled because they had discovered themselves to be transgressors of God's law, were blest, and their countenances lighted up with hope and joy."¹⁸⁹

Christ began the cleansing of the sanctuary. "Their [Millerite Adventists] mistake consisted in not understanding what the sanctuary was, and the nature of its cleansing. Jesus did enter the Most Holy Place to cleanse the sanctuary at the ending of the [prophetic] days."¹⁹⁰

Christ's final atoning ministry. "Jesus entered the Most Holy of the heavenly, at the end of the 2300 days of [Dan. 8](#), in 1844, to make a final atonement for all who could be benefited by His mediation, and to cleanse the sanctuary."¹⁹¹

"[In] the Most Holy Place ... Jesus stands before the ark, making His final intercession for all those for whom mercy still lingers, and for those who have ignorantly broken the law of God. This atonement is made for the righteous dead as well as for the righteous living. Jesus makes an atonement for those who died, not receiving the light upon God's commandments, who sinned ignorantly."¹⁹²

"I saw ... that He [Jesus] must needs enter the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary to cleanse it; to make a special atonement for Israel, and to receive the kingdom of His Father, and then return to earth and take them to dwell with Him forever."¹⁹³

It was not until 1858 that Ellen White made specific reference to atonement in connection with Christ's ministry after 1844. She employs the terms "final atonement" and "special atonement." She equates her concept of "final atonement" with "final intercession," benefitting both the righteous dead and the righteous living. "Jesus makes an atonement for those who died, not receiving the light upon God's commandments, who sinned ignorantly."¹⁹⁴ At the end of Christ's sanctuary ministry, she says, "Jesus had blotted out the sins of His people."¹⁹⁵

Investigative judgment. "While Jesus had been ministering in the Sanctuary, the judgment had been going on for the righteous dead, and then for the righteous living."¹⁹⁶

Christ's marriage to the New Jerusalem. "I saw that while Jesus was in the Most Holy Place He would be married to the New Jerusalem, and after His work should be accomplished in the Holiest, He would descend to earth in kingly power and take the precious ones to Himself who had patiently waited His return."¹⁹⁷

The Sanctuary, the Law, and the Sabbath

The sanctuary introduced the Sabbath as God's test of obedience. "After Jesus opened the door of the Most Holy the light of the Sabbath was seen, and the people of God were to be tested and proved, as God proved the children of Israel anciently, to see if they would keep His law."¹⁹⁸

The sanctuary demonstrated the perpetuity of the Decalogue. "It was represented to me that the remnant followed Jesus into the Most Holy Place, and beheld the ark, and the mercy-seat, and were captivated with their glory. Jesus raised the cover of the ark, and behold! the tables of stone, with the ten commandments written upon them. They trace down the lively oracles.... They find nothing there informing them that the Sabbath has been abolished, or changed to the first day of the week. It reads as when spoken by the mouth of God in solemn and awful grandeur upon the mount, while the lightnings flashed and the thunders rolled, and when written with His own holy finger in the tables of stone."¹⁹⁹

The sanctuary, Sabbath, and sanctification. As the heavenly sanctuary focused the attention of the remnant on the Decalogue, she says, "they start back with trembling when they see the fourth commandment living among the ten holy precepts, while a brighter light shines upon it than upon the other nine, and a halo of glory is all round it.... They see that they have been trampling upon the fourth commandment of the decalogue, and have observed a day handed down by the heathen and papists, instead of the day sanctified by Jehovah. They humble themselves before God, and mourn over their past transgressions."²⁰⁰

The Sanctuary and the Three Angels' Messages

Change in ministry inaugurates third angel's message. "As the ministration of Jesus closed in the holy place, and He passed into the Holiest, and stood before the ark containing the law of God, He sent another mighty angel to earth with the third [angel's] message."²⁰¹

The third angel's message points to the sanctuary. "The third angel closes his message with these words, Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. As He repeated these words he pointed to the heavenly Sanctuary. The minds of all who embrace this message are directed to the Most Holy Place where Jesus stands before the ark, making His final intercession for all those for whom mercy still lingers, and for those who have ignorantly broken the law of God."²⁰²

"Midnight Cry" facilitates acceptance of sanctuary doctrine. "The midnight cry ... was to prepare them [professed believers in Jesus] to enter with Jesus by faith into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary."²⁰³

A protection against deception. "Many who embraced the third [angel's] message had not an experience in the two former [first and second angels'] messages. Satan understood this, and his evil eye was upon them to overthrow them; but the third angel was pointing them to the Most Holy Place, and those who had an experience in the past messages were pointing them the way to the heavenly sanctuary. Many saw the perfect chain of truth in the angels' messages, and gladly received it. They embraced them in their order, and followed Jesus by faith into the heavenly sanctuary. These messages were represented to me as an anchor to hold the body. And as individuals receive and understand them, they are shielded against the many delusions of Satan."²⁰⁴

The Sanctuary and Salvation

The Jews. By rejecting John's message and by crucifying Jesus "[the Jews] placed themselves where they could not receive the blessing on the day of Pentecost, which would have taught them the way into the heavenly sanctuary. The rending of the veil of the temple showed that the Jewish sacrifices and ordinances would no longer be received. The great Sacrifice had been offered, and had been accepted, and the Holy Spirit which descended on the day of Pentecost carried the minds of the disciples from the earthly sanctuary to the heavenly, where Jesus had entered by His own blood, and had shed upon His disciples the benefits of His atonement. The Jews were left in complete deception and total darkness. They lost all the light they might have had upon the plan of salvation, and still trusted in their useless sacrifices and offerings."²⁰⁵

Nominal Christian churches. "Those who rejected the first [angel's] message could not be benefited by the second [angel's message], and were not benefited by the midnight cry, which was to prepare them to enter with Jesus by faith into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary. And by rejecting the two former messages, they can see no light in the third angel's message, which shows the way into the Most Holy Place. I saw that the nominal churches, as the Jews crucified Jesus, had crucified these messages, and therefore they have no knowledge of the move made in heaven, or of the way into the Most Holy, and they cannot be benefited by the intercession of Jesus there. Like the Jews, who offered their useless sacrifices, they offer up their useless prayers to the apartment which Jesus has left, and Satan, pleased with the deception of the professed followers of Christ, fastens them in his snare, and assumes a religious character, and leads the minds of these professed Christians to himself, and works with his power, his signs and lying wonders."²⁰⁶

"I saw that since Jesus had left the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary, and had entered within the second veil, the churches were left as were the Jews; and they have been filling up with every unclean and hateful bird."²⁰⁷

Close of probation. After the loud cry of the third angel's message had been proclaimed, she states, "the saints were numbered and sealed. Then I saw Jesus, who had been ministering before the ark containing the ten commandments, throw down the censer. He raised His hands ..., and with a loud voice said, *It is done...* [[Rev 22:11](#) quoted.]

"I saw that every case was then decided for life or death. Jesus had blotted out the sins of His people. He had received His kingdom, and the atonement had been made for the subjects of His kingdom.... The subjects of the kingdom were made up. The marriage of the Lamb was finished. And the kingdom, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, was given to Jesus, and the heirs of salvation, and Jesus was to reign as King of kings, and Lord of lords."

"As Jesus moved out of the Most Holy Place, I heard the tinkling of the bells upon His garment, and as He left, a cloud of darkness covered the inhabitants of the earth. There was then no mediator between guilty man, and an offended God. While Jesus had been standing between God and guilty man, a restraint was upon the people; but when Jesus stepped out from between man and the Father, the restraint was removed, and Satan had the control of man.... The saints in that fearful time [the outpouring of God's wrath in the seven last plagues], after the close of Jesus' mediation, were living in the sight of a holy God, without an intercessor."²⁰⁸

Satan, the scapegoat. "The sins which had been confessed while He [Jesus] was in the Most Holy Place, He placed back upon the originator of sin, the devil. He must suffer the punishment of these sins."²⁰⁹

The Sanctuary in the Book of Revelation

In 1862 the *Review and Herald* published a series of studies on the book of Revelation that Uriah Smith developed for his Sabbath School class. These studies expanded the understanding of the sanctuary doctrine in the following way:

1. John's entrance into the sanctuary. The open door in heaven and the invitation to "come up hither" (Rev 4:1), suggest that John entered into "the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary." Smith sees evidence for this in verse 5 which pictures seven burning lamps of fire which he identifies with the seven-branched candlestick of the earthly sanctuary. "These burning lamps in the earthly and in the heavenly sanctuaries, during both dispensations, represent the Holy Spirit in all its operation, here called the seven Spirits of God."²¹⁰

The "sea of glass like unto crystal" before God's throne (4:6) Smith considers as "literal and tangible as the redeemed beings upon it." He suggests it might be "the very foundation of the sanctuary and city, and may even extend as a border around about the city."²¹¹

2. Christ's sanctuary ministry. Smith believed that the scene at the golden altar of incense (Rev 8:3–5) "introduced the ministration of Christ, the hope of the church during the dreadful scenes of the sounding trumpets." "These verses," he says, "do not relate to the trumpets," but to Christ's ministry in "the heavenly sanctuary during the Christian age" in which the seven trumpets were to sound.²¹²

He notes that the "entire ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary is probably here illustrated." As evidence, he refers to the fact that "the angel was given *much* incense, to offer with the prayers of *all* saints" (8:3). "The angel's filling the censer with fire and casting it into the earth, may illustrate the close of Christ's ministration."²¹³

3. The sanctuary doctrine: the new commission. In Revelation 10:11, Smith sees "a new commission" given to the remnant church. He believes it to be the proclamation of the third angel's message spelled out in the following verse: "And there was given me a reed like unto a rod: and the angel stood, saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein" (11:1).

This message is "connected with the temple of God in heaven," he says, "and is designed to fit up a class of people as worshipers therein." The "temple," in this case, could not mean the church, because "the church is brought to view in connection with this temple as 'them that worship therein.' The temple is therefore the literal temple in heaven, and the worshipers the true church on earth."²¹⁴

"The call to rise and measure the temple of God," he says, indicates "a prophetic command to the church to give the subject of the temple or sanctuary a special examination."²¹⁵ How was the sanctuary to be measured or examined? His answer: "We do it with the message."

"We conclude that the measuring rod is the special message now given to the church, which embraces all the truths peculiar to this time, including the Ten Commandments." "By this message," he continues, "our attention has been called to the temple above, and through it the light and truth on this subject has come out." "Thus," he concludes, "we measure the temple and the altar, or ministration connected with that temple, the work and position of our great High Priest; and we measure the worshipers with that position of the rod which relates to character, namely, the Ten Commandments."²¹⁶

The phrase, "but the court which is without the temple, leave out," he says reveals that "the attention of the church is now directed to the inner temple, and the service there," making Christ's high-priestly ministry the focal point of the church.²¹⁷

Ignorance of Christ's Priesthood

In view of the importance of Christ's heavenly sanctuary ministry, various writers reflect upon the ignorance among Christians on this subject. R. F. Cottrell indicates that this sad situation had been predicted in prophecy. He notes that a "power has been manifested, spoken of in Rev. 13, who 'opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his *tabernacle*, and them that dwell in heaven.'"

As a result, "men are looking on earth for the sanctuary, either to Rome or to Jerusalem, or some other place, where they have no warrant from Scripture to look for it."²¹⁸ Earlier he had blamed the papacy for this situation because it had erected "his sanctuaries on earth, and diverted the minds of men from the true [heavenly sanctuary], so that the latter has been almost entirely lost sight of."²¹⁹

James White described Satan's strategy to draw away the attention of God's people from the sanctuary when Christ began His priestly ministry as follows:

"He baptized his heathen deities, and called them Christian. The Pantheon, or 'asylum of all the gods,' easily became the 'sanctuary of all the saints;' and the statue of Jupiter, by an easy metamorphosis became that of Paul or Peter. But more than this: he here set up in his temple at Rome, a blasphemous being, a monster Man of Sin, who should exalt himself above all that is called God, and turn away mankind from the mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, by pretending to dispense those favors which are the prerogative of Deity alone. Thus the Papacy has trodden under foot the 'host,' the 'holy city,' the sanctuary above and its minister, by wearing out the saints of the Most High, and lifting up his voice in blasphemy against God, his tabernacle and them that dwell in heaven. Rev. 13:6."²²⁰

However, Cottrell stresses that prophecy had predicted a change in this situation in the time of the end. "Since knowledge has increased in these last days, in fulfillment of the prophecy of Dan. 12:4, light has broken upon this subject." As a result, "we find, not only that the sanctuary in heaven is the grand center of the Christian system, as the earthly was of the typical, but that this subject is the center and citadel of present truth."²²¹

Because the sanctuary reveals the unchanging nature of God's commandments and the Sabbath, Cottrell says, it is not surprising that the opponents of Seventh-day Adventists are trying to demolish "this tower of our strength—the sanctuary."²²² James White agrees. The sanctuary doctrine is a "citadel of strength" where "all the great columns of present truth center; and our system of truth forever remains unshaken while this citadel stands."²²³

Concluding Summary

The sanctuary doctrine of Seventh-day Adventists is rooted in Daniel 8. At the time the Second Advent movement emerged, students of the Bible held various interpretations of the sanctuary mentioned in Daniel 8:14. Each depended on the interpreter's identity of the little horn. The majority of commentators identified the horn with Rome (pagan and papal) or Islam; a minority linked it with Antiochus IV.

Various commentators felt that the OT sanctuary services had relevance for the Christian church. They saw Leviticus as a key for understanding Christ's priestly ministry described in Hebrews. The Jewish autumn festivals, especially the Day of Atonement, were associated with the Second Advent and the judgment.

Within the Second Advent movement, the Millerites—the immediate spiritual forefathers of Seventh-day Adventists—followed the longstanding historicist hermeneutical tradition that identified the little horn of Daniel 8 as pagan and papal Rome. Consequently, they generally interpreted the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 as the church or the earth and expected the cleansing of both to take place at the Second Advent.

During the 1843–1844 time-setting movements, the attention of Adventists gradually focused on Christ's high-priestly ministry. Josiah Litch was one of the first to see a relationship between Leviticus, Daniel, and Hebrews. He identified the anointing of the earthly sanctuary at its inauguration (Exod 40:9–15; Lev 8) as a type of the anointing of the heavenly sanctuary by Christ at the end of the 70 weeks (Dan 9). These 70 weeks formed the first period of the 2300 days (Dan 8), while the remainder of the period pertained to Christ's heavenly ministry as described in Hebrews.

William Miller, like some others before him, suggested that the OT spring and autumn festivals each had typological significance. Thus, he associated the cleansing of the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 with the Day of Atonement which he interpreted to be a type of Christ's current atoning ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. Samuel Snow refined Miller's views and calculated that the exact time for the cleansing of the sanctuary (at the termination the 2300 days) would be on October 22, 1844.

These discussions naturally directed the attention of the Adventists to Christ's heavenly sanctuary ministry. Christians generally held the belief that after His ascension Christ entered into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary (or heaven itself) to perform His intercessory work. Therefore, the Millerites concluded that after the completion of His ministry, Christ would come from the Most Holy Place to bless His people on October 22, 1844, just as the earthly high priest did on the Day of Atonement.

An intense search developed after the Disappointment to solve the impasse about the delay of the Second Advent. It was soon discovered that the problem did not lie in an incorrect mathematical calculation but in an incorrect view of the sanctuary and its cleansing. A more consistent and careful application of the historicist hermeneutic to the subject of the sanctuary and Christ's role as bridegroom and High Priest led to a new and deeper understanding of His high-priestly ministry that explained the significance of Daniel 8:14.

The searchers found that Christ's coming as bridegroom was not His return to the earth but His coming to the Father for the wedding, at which time He would receive the kingdom (Dan 7). Then He would return to earth for His people. In addition, they discovered through historicist exegesis that the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 was the new covenant sanctuary in heaven. Its cleansing began at the end of the 2300 year period as part of Christ's final atoning priestly ministry.

The study by Sabbatarian Adventists of the "cleansing of the sanctuary," especially in the light of Leviticus and Hebrews resulted in the formulation of the sanctuary doctrine. Hebrews supported the view of a two-apartment heavenly sanctuary, similar to that of the earthly sanctuary. Each apartment represented a phase of Christ's high-priestly ministry. After His ascension Christ began the first phase of His ministry as Intercessor for the forgiveness of sins in the first apartment. In 1844 He began the second and final phase of His ministry, the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. While the sins of God's obedient people would be blotted out during this last phase, the names of false believers would be removed from the book of life.

It was observed that the sanctuary could be defiled by open transgression as well as by confession of sins. Just as the typical sanctuary was defiled by the apostasy of God's people, so the antitype was defiled by the apostate Christian power symbolized by the little horn of Daniel 8. The defilement of the typical sanctuary by confession occurred when the confessed sins of repentant sinners were transferred to it by the sacrificial blood. Similarly, the heavenly sanctuary was defiled by the confessed sins of God's people which were being transferred to it through Christ's blood.

At the antitypical day of atonement Christ's blood also functioned as the agent to cleanse the polluted sanctuary. The result was a cleansed sanctuary and people. Satan, as scapegoat and instigator of evil, received the sins of the righteous in judgment.

The Sabbatarian Adventists developed their sanctuary doctrine from the understanding that a real two-apartment sanctuary existed in heaven of which the earthly sanctuary was a copy. They believed that without such a concept there was no justification for a two-phased high-priestly ministry of Christ with its change in 1844.

The newly developed sanctuary doctrine brought to view the inauguration of the final judgment of God's people—an investigative judgment—due to Christ's entrance into the Most Holy Place. It also disclosed the perpetual validity of the Decalogue, including the seventh-day Sabbath, as the standard for the judgment. This made God's law and the Sabbath a special test for His people since 1844. Upon completion of this work Christ would return to earth to give His people their final reward.

During Christ's closing ministry, the people on earth were to hear the sealing message that was to call individuals everywhere to repentance and to the true worship of the Creator by observing God's law, and in particular, the Sabbath. The present time was considered the sealing time. It would last until the end of Christ's priestly ministry. At that time His people would be sealed with the seal of the living God for protection against divine wrath in the seven last plagues. This remaining probationary time called for "the patience" of the saints.

The sanctuary doctrine broadened the horizons of the early Sabbatarian Adventist pioneers at a time when they thought the door of mercy had closed. Early study enabled them to realize that the atonement had not ended in 1844 but would continue until the completion of Christ's sanctuary ministry. They came to realize that Christ's entrance into the Most Holy did not affect His intercessory ministry. He now continued this work in the Second Apartment.

At the same time Christ began His work of cleansing the sanctuary through the investigative judgment and the blotting out of sins. A study of the Day of Atonement sacrifices revealed that in the type mercy was still obtainable for repentant sinners on that day itself. Thus, they reasoned by analogy that mercy was also available to the truly repentant sinner on the antitypical day of atonement since 1844. This insight provided the theological foundation that salvation was obtainable to everyone who had not willfully rejected the Advent proclamation of the first and second angels' messages.

The sanctuary service also suggested that human probation would close when Christ terminated His ministry in the Second Apartment. Then God's sealed people would live without an Intercessor during the final time of trouble.

After the Disappointment the manifestation of the prophetic gift confirmed through visions the newly developed sanctuary understanding. For the believers this was a great encouragement in their faith and mission.

The Sabbatarian Adventist pioneers were well aware that their sanctuary views differed substantially from those held by their contemporaries. When Christ's sanctuary ministry was presented as the key to unlock the 1844 disappointment, it was discussed widely among Adventists. Soon, however, it was rejected because many insisted that the event terminating the 2300 years had to be the Second Advent.

A strong controversy ensued in which the sanctuary doctrine was further clarified and refined. A study of this polemic and the arguments set forth in favor of the sanctuary doctrine continues to be useful. Modern objections and charges against the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary theology are in many respects quite similar to earlier challenges. Such a study, therefore, is indispensable for a clear comprehension and any fruitful discussion of this doctrine.

Chapter IV

The Investigative Judgment: Its Early Development*

C. Mervyn Maxwell

Editorial Synopsis. Contrary to popular opinion Ellen G. White did not originate the sanctuary doctrine of Seventh-day Adventists. Her most detailed and mature writings on the subject did not appear until the 1880s.

Actually, the concept of a preadvent “trial” judgment ([Dan 7](#)) followed by a Second Advent “executive judgment” was first argued by the Methodist theologian, Josiah Litch, a prominent Millerite minister, as early as 1840 and 1842.

After the Great Disappointment in 1844 non-Sabbatarian Millerites continued to examine Litch’s concept of final judgment to which they also linked [Leviticus 16](#) (Day of Atonement) and Christ’s wedding parables. The *fact* of a preadvent judgment, the transit of Christ from the Father’s right hand to the Father’s judgment throne, the limiting of the [Daniel 7](#) “trial” judgment to the people of God, and the need for God’s people to keep their garments of character spotless were studied out and published in Millerite papers apart from any influence from young Ellen Harmon.

These positions, however, were soon abandoned by their early advocates. Sabbatarian Adventists on the other hand retained and amplified them. They perceived that the sanctuary in [Daniel 8:14](#) was the heavenly sanctuary where Christ had ministered since October 22, 1844, in the Most Holy Place. Following Christ by faith into His new phase of ministry, they came to see the significance of the opened temple in heaven and its focus on “the ark of His testament” ([Rev 11:19](#)). Their attention was thus directed to the validity of the Ten Commandments and its fourth precept commanding the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath. “Linking ‘sanctuary’ with ‘Sabbath’ provided vital dynamics for both concepts,” especially as Sabbatarians saw the time frame—from 1844 to the close of human probation—and sensed the urgency of the judgment hour announced by the first angel’s message ([Rev 14:6–7](#)).

Concentrating on the doctrine of the millennium and the executive judgment at its close, James White at first rejected the idea of a preadvent judgment of professed believers. However, by 1857 he was in total agreement with Joseph Bates, the principal early Sabbatarian writer on these matters (1846–1850), employing the phrase “investigative judgment” for the [Daniel 7](#) scene—a phrase that became common terminology among Sabbathkeepers. James White especially applied the Laodicean message ([Rev 3](#)) to the Sabbathkeeping Adventists in connection with the “investigative judgment.” He saw it as a much needed appeal for repentance and spiritual preparedness on the part of God’s people who were now living in the time of Christ’s final judgment work in heaven.

Chapter Outline

- I. Introduction
- II. Developments to October 1844
- III. The Situation Immediately After the Disappointment
- IV. Early Developments Among Sabbatarian Adventists
- V. James White and the Investigative Judgment
- VI. The Role of Ellen White
- VII. Summary

Introduction

“God will bring every deed into judgment, with every secret thing” ([Eccl 12:14](#)). “We shall all stand before the judgment seat of God” ([Rom 14:10](#)).

The Bible presents with certainty the prospect of final judgment. Most Christians conceive the final judgment to be a single divine *event*. And Paul’s words on Mars Hill seem to confirm their understanding: God, he said, “has fixed a day on which he will judge the world” ([Acts 17:31](#)). But Seventh-day Adventists have come to regard the final judgment as including at least four successive phases,¹ the first of which they have historically referred to as the “investigative judgment,” more recently, as the “preadvent judgment.”

It is our purpose to examine the historical development of the investigative judgment. Before we do so, however, it will be helpful to preview the biblical data which, over the years, Seventh-day Adventists have perceived as evidence pointing to this doctrine, as well as to summarize the doctrine itself and some of its ramifications.

Biblical Data

1. **Daniel 7.** In this classic portrayal of judgment day in heaven, both Ancient of days and Son of man “come” to a new place in heaven for judgment. The context locates this judgment later than the 1260 year-days of the little horn but prior to the Second Advent.
2. **Daniel 12:1–2; Revelation 20:6.** At the Second Coming, the blessed and holy, whose names have been found in the book of life, are resurrected to receive life everlasting. Here is additional evidence that the judgment of [Daniel 7](#) precedes the Second Coming, enabling the true saints to be sorted out prior to the resurrection.
3. **Daniel 8:14.** On the principle of parallelism, [Daniel 8:14](#) provides the date (1844) for the commencement of the [Daniel 7](#) judgment. The sanctuary language of this verse also invokes the typology of the Day of Atonement.
4. **Leviticus 16 and 23.** On the Day of Atonement, when the high priest entered the Most Holy Place to cleanse the sanctuary and also the congregation of their sins, the people—as on a day of *judgment*—were to “afflict their souls” or be judged and “cut off.”
5. **The analogy of spring and autumn types.** The spring ceremonies (Passover, Wave Sheaf, and Pentecost) were fulfilled in connection with the first coming of Christ. By analogy, the autumn ceremonies (Trumpets, Atonement, and Tabernacles) apply to events related to His second coming. This argument places the day of atonement judgment at the end of time with or without regard to [Daniel 7](#) and 8.
6. **Malachi 3.** The Lord will “come” suddenly to His temple to “purge” or cleanse the sons of Levi. The coming and cleansing recall [Daniel 7](#) and [Leviticus 16](#).
7. **Hebrews 8 and 9.** The existence of a heavenly sanctuary related to the earthly one is affirmed, with its need to be purified at some point in the future.
8. **Acts 3:19.** In a special sense sins will be blotted out in relation to the return of Jesus. This verse sheds light on the antitypical day of atonement when the heavenly High Priest, just prior to His return to earth, cleanses people as well as sanctuary from every sin.
9. **The wedding parables.** In [Matthew 25](#) Jesus spoke of “ready” saints who would go “into the marriage” near the end of time. Evidently he meant they would go in only by faith, because in [Luke 12:35–37](#) He spoke of His followers as waiting until He would return from the wedding. In [Matthew 22](#) He portrayed the wedding guests as being examined (judged) by the King to see whether they were wearing the wedding garment.
10. **Other wedding imagery.** According to the NT Christ is at present betrothed to His corporate church and is busy purifying it from every spot or wrinkle. When His church is fit to be His bride—that is, after the cleansing and examination period is over—He marries it, thus establishing His kingdom. Then He returns to earth to take His church members to the wedding supper, which follows immediately ([Eph 5](#); [Dan 7](#); [Luke 12:35–37](#); [Luke 19:11–12](#); [Rev 19](#)).
11. **Revelation 14:6–12.** The first angel announces the arrival of the judgment hour while the gospel is still being preached. The second and third angels call the saints to keep the commandments of God and to separate themselves from the false Christians of Babylon who will receive the mark of the beast. Thus, while the judgment is sorting out God’s people in heaven, a sorting out process is called for among the professed people of God on earth.
12. **1 Peter 4:17.** “Judgment ... [must] begin with the household of God.” Peter’s words echo the teaching of [Ezekiel 9:6](#): “begin at my sanctuary.” They have special relationship and relevance to the end-of-time sealing work of [Revelation 7:1–3](#).
13. **Revelation 22:11.** The decree that the wicked are to go on sinning must apply at the close of human probation, for God would never command sinners to sin while there was hope for their salvation. Likewise, it must precede the Second Coming, for the Second Coming will destroy sinners, preventing their continuance in sin.
14. **The New Testament doctrine of perseverance.** The person who “has the Son has life” right now, but he will be saved only if he “endures to the end” ([1 John 5:12](#); [Matt 24:13](#)). A believer is expected to call Jesus “Lord”; but unless he obeys Jesus, calling Him “Lord” will not avail ([Rom 10:9](#); [Matt 7:21](#)). To be forgiven ultimately, the Christian must be forgiving ([Matt 6:14](#)). A Gentile grafted into Paul’s olive tree, if unpersevering, will be cut off as surely as the Jewish nation once was ([Rom 11:21](#)). We are saved by faith, but only if our faith is a living faith that produces acts of mercy and goodness ([Jas 2](#)).

The large number of scriptures cited in this summary indicate that the Seventh-day Adventist doctrine of the investigative judgment is not derived from some single isolated proof text, as some of its opponents have averred. It has grown out of a large pool of data gathered widely from both Old and New Testaments.

The Doctrine and its Implications

In Seventh-day Adventist theology, the investigative judgment is the first phase of the final judgment. It commenced after the close of the 1260 year-days of [Daniel 7](#), coincident with the termination, in 1844, of the “2300 evening-mornings” of [Daniel 8](#), when Jesus entered triumphantly into the inner arena of the heavenly sanctuary.

The judging process, in progress since 1844, has been one of opening before angels and other intelligent beings the records of all the “professed people of God” who have ever lived, whose names have been recorded in the book of life.²

Among the principal *results* of the investigative judgment is (1) the vindication of the Godhead. Through the centuries God has allowed His followers—and all other human beings as well—to endure inordinate quantities of suffering. He has allowed sinners to live and has even forgiven many of them. In so doing, He has drawn upon Himself the blame for every evil that He has apparently condoned. He has “borne the guilt of the world.” During the investigative judgment questions left unanswered at the cross are settled and God is seen to be true and righteous.

The investigative judgment also results in (2) a grand enlargement of the power of the Son of man; Christ receives His kingdom.

The little horn that persecuted the saints during the 1260 years of [Daniel 7](#) was the dominant Christian church of its era. The little horn was composed of professed people of God. Professed people of God—at that time, as at so many other times in history—persecuted other professed people of God. The investigative judgment (3) reveals to the universe which of God’s professed believers have violated their privileges; their names are blotted out of the book of life. At the same time, it (4) vindicates God’s true followers,³ those who have maintained an effective relationship to their Saviour. Their sins are blotted out. Their names are retained in the book of life. And their good deeds, performed in and through the grace of God, stand permanently recorded in the Lord’s book of remembrance ([Mal 3](#)).

In His teachings, Christ sought to impress men with the certainty of the coming judgment, and with its publicity.... It is to be held in the presence of other worlds, that the love, the integrity, the service, of man for God, may be honored to the highest degree. There will be no lack of glory and honor.⁴

But in Seventh-day Adventist doctrine Christ’s special post-1844 ministry on our behalf is not confined specifically to investigative judgment. On the typical Day of Atonement the high priest cleansed the sanctuary and also cleansed the people who worshiped at the sanctuary. Analogously, [Malachi 3](#) promises that the Lord, upon coming suddenly to His temple, would purge (or cleanse) the sons of Levi.

The King is examining His wedding guests to see whether they have retained the wedding garment. But as Saviour as well as Lord, He does all He can to help His people abide and grow in grace.

Thus, since 1844 Jesus has been purifying His people by, among other things, presenting the Sabbath to them with unique energy and restoring the Spirit of Prophecy. The writings of Ellen White are to be viewed as loving messages from the heavenly High Priest, sent to teach people how to receive His perfect righteousness in order to become holy as He is holy ([1 Pet 1:15–16](#)). The Sabbath is a reminder that God is our sanctifier. When kept holy, it is also a means by which He sanctifies us. “In order to keep the Sabbath holy, men must themselves be holy. Through faith they must become partakers of the righteousness of Christ.”⁵

The Sabbath and the Spirit of Prophecy are inseparable components of the broader significance of Christ’s contemporary work in the heavenly sanctuary. They help prepare people for examination at the investigative judgment.

Proclamation of the Sabbath (the third angel’s message) and pleading with people to separate from “Babylon” (the second angel’s message and [Revelation 18:1–4](#)) are among the earthly counterparts of the heavenly cleansing process.

So it can be said that Seventh-day Adventists believe that their concept of the first phase of the final judgment is rooted in Scripture, that it has implications both cosmic and experiential, and that it is vital to a full understanding of the contemporary work of Jesus in man’s behalf.

Developments to October 1844

We are now ready to trace the steps by which Adventists developed the doctrine of investigative judgment.

Final Judgment at Second Advent (Miller)

Within the Second Advent awakening—a broad, intercontinental phenomenon—William Miller, founder of the American branch of the awakening, was among the first to relate the judgment to the termination of the 2300 days. Employing the principle that the visions of [Daniel 2, 7, and 8](#) are parallel, he concluded that [Daniel 8:14](#) provides the time (1843, later revised to 1844) for the judgment scene in [Daniel 7](#).⁶ The conclusion led him to preach the first angel’s message—“the hour of his judgment is come.”

Initially, Miller’s 1844 judgment was not preadvent. For him, as for most Christians, the final judgment would take place only at the Second Coming.

When Miller read in [Daniel 8:14](#), “then shall the sanctuary be cleansed” (KJV), he concluded after much study that the sanctuary was the earth and that its cleansing would be the conflagration accompanying the Second Advent. But the margin of Miller’s Bible read, “then shall the sanctuary be *justified*.” So Miller also concluded—indeed, this was his original conclusion—that a special spiritual cleansing of the church would occur at the Second Coming. “The whole church will then be cleansed from all uncleanness, and presented without spot or wrinkle, and will then be clothed with fine linen, clean and white.”⁷

Final Judgment Precedes Second Advent (Litch)

The second most influential Millerite expositor, after Miller himself, was the Methodist theologian Josiah Litch. Litch was the first American Adventist to teach that the judgment of [Revelation 20:11–13](#) must precede the Second Coming. As early as 1840 he argued that it must be so, inasmuch, so he said, as it is a judgment only of the dead and not of persons living at the end.⁸ Refining his view, in 1842 he observed that the divine act of raising some persons to life and others to death at the Second Coming constitutes an “executive judgment” that must necessarily be preceded by a “trial.” The “trial” he linked to the judgment scene of [Daniel 7](#), suggesting for its beginning 1798, at the close of the 1260 year-days.⁹

Litch’s view influenced Apollos Hale, one of the more prominent of the Millerite editors.¹⁰ In the summer of 1844 many other Adventists in Maine also came to believe that the judgment had already commenced.¹¹

Antitypical Day of Atonement (Snow)

Early in 1843 Miller observed that the springtime festivals (Passover, Wave Sheaf, and Pentecost) were fulfilled in connection with Christ’s first coming. In particular, he noted that the Passover type was fulfilled at the cross in the *spring* of A.D. 31. By analogy, Miller reasoned that the autumn festivals (Trumpets, Atonement, and Tabernacles) would be fulfilled in connection with the Second Coming of Christ. Notably, he proposed that the Day of Atonement might well be fulfilled in the *fall* of the year that closed the 2300 days.¹²

In the summer of 1844 Samuel Snow developed Miller’s analogy argument. He showed that in no case could the 2300 days end sooner than the autumn of 1844 because they did not start until the autumn of 457 B.C. He then urged that the *precision* of the fulfillment of the spring types at the exact time of Passover, Wave Sheaf, and Pentecost presaged the precise fulfillment of the Day of Atonement type on an actual Day of Atonement. Other Millerites soon noted that in 1844 the Day of Atonement would fall on October 22.

Thus, well before the Great Disappointment, Millerite Adventists were looking for the fulfillment of the Day of Atonement type on October 22, 1844. Some of them, at least, believed and taught that the judgment scenes of [Daniel 7](#) and [Revelation 20:11–13](#) would occur prior to that date and that, indeed, they had already commenced. Because all Millerite Adventists assumed that the Day of Atonement would be fulfilled at the Second Advent, for them any preadvent judgment inescapably fell prior to October 22, 1844.

The Situation Immediately After the Disappointment

After the Great Disappointment, American Adventism divided three ways. If we assume an outside total of 100,000 Millerites, we can say that perhaps half of them quickly gave up all faith in the 2300 days. A second group, numbering perhaps 30 to 50 thousand, retained the 2300 days; but renouncing October 22, 1844, they looked toward a future termination date. The third group, only a few thousand at most, clung to both the 2300 days and October 22, 1844, but very soon reinterpreted the termination event. The day of atonement event prophesied for October 22, 1844, they said, was the commencement of the preadvent judgment.

October 22, Judgment Commences

Enoch Jacobs, a member of this third group and editor of *The Western Midnight Cry* (soon to become *The Day-Star*) of Cincinnati, Ohio, wrestled with the meaning of the Disappointment in his issue of November 29, 1844. Citing Samuel Snow on Jesus as our high priest on the Day of Atonement, he pointed to the breastplate of judgment worn on that day and asked, "Why is it called thus?" That is, why is it called the breastplate of *judgment*?

Jacobs also observed that no one's name could be borne on the breastplate of judgment unless he met the requirement of afflicting his soul ([Lev 23:29, 32](#)). All other persons, he said, citing [John 3:18](#), were condemned already and suffered judgment "to go against them" by "default." Thus he implied that the judgment that began on October 22 dealt only with the cases of God's people.

Other arguments used by Jacobs in this early article included [Hebrews 8](#) and [9](#) on Christ's ministry in heaven, [Acts 3:19-21](#), and [1 Peter 4:17](#).

Jacobs urged, "Unless something as decisive as the setting of the judgment took place on the tenth day [October 22, 1844], the antitype is not yet given," prophecy is not fulfilled, and we are yet in darkness.¹³

A month later,¹⁴ under the heading "Intolerance," Jacobs sought tolerance for brethren who were insisting that Christ had "come" from His Father's throne ([Heb 8](#)) to His judgment seat ([Dan 7](#)) where God was now sitting in judgment on the world before Christ would appear personally to execute judgment.

Here Christ's 1844 transit from the Father's throne to the judgment scene was based not so much on [Leviticus 16](#) as on [Hebrews 8](#) and [Daniel 7](#).

In January 1845, Apollos Hale, editor of *The Advent Herald* in Boston, and Joseph Turner, editor of *The Hope of Israel* in Portland, Maine, collaborated to produce *The Advent Mirror*. In their editorial, "Has Not the Saviour Come as the Bridegroom," these Millerite leaders called for a deeper understanding of Christ's wedding parables.

Wedding Parables

Before the Disappointment, the Millerites had taken great interest in the parable of the virgins ([Matt 25](#)) and had endeavored to be "ready" to "go into the wedding" with the wise young women. Turner and Hale now pointed to the wedding parable in [Luke 12](#) that says we must wait until Christ returns *from* the wedding; they also noted the other wedding parable in [Matthew 22](#) that describes the king examining his guests to determine whether they are wearing the wedding garment. Turner and Hale linked these wedding parables to Christ's reception of His kingdom at the judgment in [Daniel 7](#). "The coming of the Bridegroom to the marriage," they said, "must denote that change in his heavenly state, in which he comes to the Ancient of Days to receive dominion" before the marriage. "*The judgment is here!*" they cried (emphasis theirs).

In the meantime, Turner and Hale continued in a pastoral vein, we are "now in the guestchamber, where all depends on our keeping our garments," for "we have only the final examination of the King to pass." This pastoral concern for "keeping our garments" during the preadvent judgment was to be augmented greatly in later years.

On February 6, 1845, William Miller wrote a letter, published in the *Day-Star* of March 11, in which he approved the position taken by Turner and Hale in the *Advent Mirror*. "I do believe in the main they are right," he said. We are to await Christ's return from the wedding. "Christ has risen up from his mercy-seat and now stands as a Judge at the door."

Miller followed up this letter with another dated March 20, published in the *Day-Star* for April 8, in which he specifically defended the validity of "the 10th day, seventh month" (October 22, 1844). He cited, among other data, the first angel's message, "the hour of his Judgment is come," and inquired, "Is there any thing in the scriptures to show that the hour has not come, or in our present position to show, that God is not now in his last Judicial character deciding the cases of all the righteous, so that Christ (speaking after the manner of men) will know whom to collect at his coming?" (Here is one of Litch's original arguments.) Miller provided a list of judgment events in sequence, using [Daniel 7](#) and [Revelation 20](#). "Who can say," he asked, that "God is not already justifying his Sanctuary [[Dan 8:14](#), margin], and will yet justify us in preaching the time?"

The *Day-Star* for March 25, 1845, reprinted from the *Hope of Israel* an article "To the Believers Scattered Abroad," written presumably by that magazine's editor, Joseph Turner, whom we have already met. In it, Turner, we assume, reaffirmed the concept that the wedding in Christ's parables is the reception of the kingdom in [Daniel 7](#). Christ, he stated, served initially in the "first tabernacle" at the right hand of the Father ([Heb 8](#) and [9](#)). In 1844 He moved to the inner court ([Dan 7](#)) to receive His kingdom. Here again is Christ's 1844 movement based not on [Leviticus](#) but on [Hebrews](#) and [Daniel](#).

Turner's article related the wedding parables to the affliction of soul so important to the Day of Atonement in [Leviticus](#). He warned: "The examination [of the wedding guests] is now passing, and will be all over when the Lord appears." "It may be asked," he continued, "how any are found here not having on the wedding garment, as only they that were ready went in, and the door was shut." He replied, once more with pastoral concern, "They have not kept their loins girded with truth,—they have lost their garments through want of watchfulness; or else their robe is spotted within and being 'naked' their shame appears [[Revelation 16:15](#)]."

Turner's use of [Revelation 16:15](#) and his reference to keeping the loins girded with truth ([Eph 6:14](#) and [Luke 12:35-37](#)) should especially be kept in mind when we examine developments among Sabbatarian Adventists shortly.

Millerite editors could find abundant occasion for pastoral concern in the apostasy of their fellow Adventists. It was becoming evident to at least some of them that being ready at one time is insufficient. Even being as deeply spiritually ready as the Millerites were in October 1844 is not enough. A person must *stay* ready. A Christian must not only put the garment on; he must keep it on. And keep it clean.

We return to Samuel Snow, the able exponent of the Day of Atonement as the date for Christ's return, now editor of *The Jubilee Standard*. In his issue for April 24, 1845, in an article titled, "And the Door Was Shut," Snow too related the wedding parables to [Daniel 7](#). He said that Jesus went to the wedding in 1844 when He left "heaven itself" ([Heb 8](#) and [9](#)) and descended to the New Jerusalem to receive His kingdom ([Dan 7](#)). Currently, he continued, the "examination" of the wedding guests is in process.

Like Josiah Litch before him, Snow used [Daniel 7](#) and [Revelation 20:12](#) to prove that the judgment must indeed sit prior to the Second Coming. Jesus went to the Father "while the Ancient of Days (i.e., God the Father) was sitting in judgment. Therefore the judgment of the living and the dead must precede the appearing of the Son of man to *execute judgment*."

God the Father, Snow stated, is deciding the cases of all, living and dead. "During ... this process of judgment the Son of man mounts the car of glory, and comes before his Father [[Dan 7](#)] ... and there"—we recognize the breastplate argument—"confesses the names of all who are not ashamed to confess him before men. The Father hears with an approving smile, and, the reconciliation being complete, the Father gives the kingdom to his Son, and gives him authority to execute judgment also because he is the Son of man [[John 5:27](#)]."

Consider for a moment the breastplate argument. Surely it is good news and "gospel." Christ's breastplate, like the Levitical high priest's, was perceived to bear the names of the people of God. In the judgment Christ "confesses the names of all who are not ashamed to confess him before men." With what result? "The Father hears with an approving smile, ... the reconciliation being complete."

Summary

From the material reviewed thus far, we have seen that the basic concept of a final judgment consisting of two parts—a preadvent trial and a Second Advent execution—arose at least as early as 1840 in the writings of Josiah Litch. In the papers we have looked at, it was drawn primarily from [Daniel 7](#), [Leviticus 16](#) (the Day of Atonement, applied to the end of time by comparison with Passover and the cross), and wedding parables. [Daniel 8:14](#) was ever a part of the picture, but principally to supply the year 1844. The *fact* of the preadvent judgment, the transit of the High Priest from the Father's right hand to the Father's judgment throne, the limiting of this phase of the judgment to the people of God, and the experiential need of God's people to keep their garments spotless, were based on the other scriptures just mentioned, and more. And we have seen that the preadvent judgment was presented as good news for the saints. It was "gospel."

Early Developments Among Sabbatarian Adventists

The future founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church were well aware of the developments we have been discussing. They belonged to that third group of post-Disappointment Millerites with whom Jacobs, Turner, Hale, Snow, and Miller for a time also identified themselves; and they subscribed to their periodicals.

Sabbatarians Retain and Amplify Early Explanations

One of the future founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church was Joseph Bates, of Fairhaven, Massachusetts. In his 1847 *Way Marks and High Heaps*,¹⁵ he acknowledged that “this subject of the coming of the Bridegroom [to the judgment scene of Daniel 7]” had been “ably discussed and very clearly seen and admitted” by persons other than himself. Bates added ruefully that “the backsliding of its principal advocates” was no “proof of its non-fulfillment.... The scriptures are our guide.”

Bates’ words indicate that by 1847 the men whose statements we have been quoting had largely abandoned the significance of 1844. They had looked for Christ to return sometime in 1845, and when He had not returned, they had revised their positions drastically. On the contrary, Bates and his group of Sabbatarian Adventists went on to enhance and enrich the concept of the preadvent judgment. Before 1850 they related it to the Sabbath, the seal of God, and the third angel’s message in such a way as to give it both permanence and a special application to daily life.

Before looking at these developments, let us remember that the concept of preadvent judgment was originally conceived by persons other than the founders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and independent of the visions of Ellen White. Almost all the material presented thus far was dated prior to Ellen White’s Bridegroom vision of mid-February 1845, and we can be certain that even though the statements we cited from Miller and Snow bore later dates, they were written without reference to that vision.

We have mentioned Joseph Bates and will return to him later. Another founder of the Seventh-day Adventist Church was Hiram Edson of western New York. Edson left an undated manuscript in which he recalled that on October 23, 1844, the morning following the Great Disappointment, he first realized that in Daniel 7 the Son of man comes to the Ancient of days rather than to the earth, and that the wedding parable of Luke 12:35–37 tells us to wait on earth until Jesus returns from the wedding. It occurred to him at that time, Edson says, that on October 22, 1844 (the day before), Jesus went into the Most Holy Place in heaven to perform a particular task and to receive (marry) His kingdom. In other words, according to his manuscript, Edson, in a moment of insight on October 23, 1844, suddenly understood several of the same matters that Jacobs, Turner, Hale, and others were to discover between that morning and early 1845.

But in one crucial aspect Edson’s insight on October 23 was notably deficient. His account makes no mention of his becoming aware at that time of the preadvent judgment. But a separate account of the events of October 23, 1844, made years later by his companion of that day, O.R.L. Crosier, indicates that the two of them (Edson and Crosier) on October 23 came to realize something else that the editors never recognized, namely, that the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 is not on earth but is the one in heaven.

Crosier and Edson did not publish their discoveries at once. It is not known when they did first put them into print. In the spring of 1845 a mutual friend, F. B. Hahn, launched *The Day-Dawn*, of Canandaigua, New York. When it first appeared, evidently in April, Enoch Jacobs of the *Day-Star*¹⁶ commented that the sentiments of the *Day-Dawn* differed little from those of Apollos Hale, Joseph Turner, and Samuel Snow, editors we have been citing.

The circulation of the *Day-Dawn* in post-Disappointment Adventism proved disappointing. Crosier, Edson, and Hahn turned to the *Day-Star* for a wider dissemination of their views. On February 7, 1846, an “extra” of the *Day-Star* appeared, consisting mostly of a single article, “The Law of Moses,” in which Crosier argued that the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 is the one in heaven. Its line of thought leaned primarily on Leviticus 16 and 23 (with their Day of Atonement imagery), but it also made use of many other passages. Hebrews 8 appeared as witness to a two-apartment heavenly sanctuary. Hebrews 9 appeared as evidence of the need for even the heavenly sanctuary to be cleansed.

In this article in the *Day-Star* Extra, Crosier made only passing reference to the 2300 days and to Christ’s transit across the New Jerusalem to the Most Holy Place to participate in the preadvent wedding. Such matters were familiar to his readers. Likewise, he felt no need to reestablish faith in the preadvent judgment; it was enough for him to mention the breastplate of judgment a couple of times.

Millerites had believed that the sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 was the earth. Even those Adventists who by now had come to believe that Jesus entered the Most Holy Place in 1844 still believed that in order to fulfill Daniel 8:14 He would leave the heavenly sanctuary and cleanse the earth with fire. One of Crosier’s principal points in the *Day-Star* Extra was that the sanctuary Christ was to cleanse in fulfillment of Daniel 8:14 was the very one He was now occupying. “The sanctuary of the new covenant is not on earth,” he wrote, “but the one in heaven.”¹⁷ Another of Crosier’s main points was that the cleansing of Daniel 8:14 was a cleansing from sin and so would be accomplished “by blood, and not by fire.”¹⁸

In the meantime, between the early discovery of the 1844 commencement of the preadvent judgment by Jacobs, Turner, and Hale, and the 1846 appearance of Crosier’s *Day-Star* Extra article, Ellen Harmon (later, Ellen White) experienced a number of significant visions, four of which in particular she felt should be grouped together.¹⁹

The first of these, her very first vision, of December 1844, confirmed the Millerite experience and message as light that was to be respected till the end of time. Samuel Snow’s “midnight cry” declaration that the 2300 days would end on October 22, 1844, was symbolized in this vision as a “bright light” that was to illuminate the pathway of the saints all the way to the Holy City.

The second of the special four visions, this one received in February 1845, portrayed the Father as moving into the Most Holy Place in 1844 and the Son as following Him there as Bridegroom to receive (or marry) His kingdom. The third vision, received in October 1845, spoke of the termination of Christ’s priestly ministry, the falling of the plagues, and events at the Second Coming. The fourth vision described the new earth.

Taken together, the four visions confirmed October 22, 1844, as the true conclusion of the 2300 days; pointed to Christ’s entry into the Most Holy Place at that time; and warned that at the conclusion of Christ’s special ministry in the Most Holy Place humanity will have no high priest to intercede for it.

None of the four visions specifically mentioned the preadvent judgment. The second one, however, is seen upon examination to have been based directly on the judgment scene of Daniel 7. Further, its reference to “receiving the kingdom” and returning from the wedding tied it to the contemporary discussion in Millerite papers about this judgment scene. And its counsel to “keep your garments spotless” was directly related to the advice we have read from Millerite editors urging their readers to keep properly attired while the King examines the wedding guests.

After seeing this vision Ellen said:

I saw the Father rise from the throne, and in a flaming chariot go into the holy of holies within the veil, and sit down. Then Jesus rose up from the throne, ... Those who arose when Jesus did, kept their eyes fixed on Him as He left the throne and led them out a little way. Then He raised His right arm, and we heard His lovely voice saying, “Wait here; I am going to My Father to receive the kingdom; keep your garments spotless, and in a little while I will return from the wedding and receive you to Myself.” Then a cloudy chariot, with wheels like flaming fire, surrounded by angels, came to where Jesus was. He stepped into the chariot and was borne to the holiest, where the Father sat.²⁰

That Ellen Harmon’s visions were perceived by those who trusted her to be indeed messages about the preadvent judgment is confirmed by a letter Otis Nichols wrote in April 1846, which we will look at shortly.

Need for Spiritual Preparation

Crosier's article, locating the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) in heaven, appeared in February 1846, twelve months after the Bridegroom vision.²¹ Not quite two months later, the *Day-Star* contained an extensive letter from Crosier amplifying the theme of keeping one's garment spotless during the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. Citing [1 Corinthians 3](#) and [6](#) and [Ephesians 2](#), where Paul speaks of believers as the temple of God, Crosier spoke of a special cleansing of the "spiritual sanctuary" of the church that parallels the post-1844 cleansing of the "literal sanctuary" in heaven. His choice of language is worth noting:

Many seem not to have discovered that there is a literal and a spiritual temple—the literal being the Sanctuary in New Jerusalem (literal city), and the spiritual the church—the literal occupied by Jesus Christ, our King and Priest, [Jno. 14:2](#); [Heb. 8:2](#); [9:11](#); the spiritual by the Holy Ghost. [1 Cor. 3:17](#); [6:19](#). [Eph. 2:20–22](#). Between these two there is a perfect concert of action, as Christ "prepares the place" the Spirit does the people. When he came to his temple, the sanctuary, to cleanse it; the Spirit commenced the special cleansing of the people. [Mal. 3:1–3](#).

Crosier spoke of the post-1844 cleansings of the "New Jerusalem" and "church" sanctuaries as constituting a "perfect concert of action" between the work of Christ in heaven and the work of the Holy Spirit on earth. As we shall see, other Sabbatarian Adventists also came to speak of this parallel cleansing, soon referring not only to its existence but also to its necessity. A special preadvent purification of the saints, they said, was required to qualify them to live through the preadvent judgment.

Indeed, the experience of purification was quickly seen as being itself a kind of preadvent judgment. [Revelation 14:12](#) notes the "patience" of the commandment-keeping saints at the end of time. Such noteworthy patience, Bates and others assumed, must be occasioned by the experiences endured by the saints in "their patient, trying time." Punning seriously on the word "trial," they perceived in the preadvent trials of the Sabbathkeepers a counterpart to the preadvent heavenly trial.²²

In the same month during which Crosier's letter appeared, James White published Ellen's group of four visions in the form of a broadside—a single sheet printed on one side, dated April 6, 1846. Two weeks later, on April 20, Otis Nichols, a lithographer who had become a special patron of young Ellen's, sent a copy of this broadside to William Miller. On the unprinted side, Nichols wrote a letter urging Miller to accept the visions as coming from the Lord. This is the Nichols letter we referred to previously.

The first angel's message about the time for the judgment, Nichols said, pointed to 1844. Commenting on the content of Ellen's visions, he added,

there was a change took place in heaven about that time.... The Ancient of days did change his place where Jesus was sitting at his right hand, to the throne of judgment in the Holy of holies and did sit. [Dan. 7:9](#). And Jesus,—the bridegroom—the master of the house [Luke 13:25](#) rose up and shut to the door, and came to the Ancient of days, to fulfill the legal types of the 10th day of the 7th month [Lev 16](#) chapter and to receive the kingdom.

We recognize the familiar wedding and Day of Atonement imagery and also the motion of both Father and Son to the judgment scene of [Daniel 7](#). Nichols, and others among Ellen White's associates, saw in her early visions an endorsement of the preadvent judgment.

Contributions by Joseph Bates

We turn now to concentrate on the contributions of Joseph Bates who, for the next few years, would be the principal author in the Sabbatarian group. In May 1846, only a few weeks after Nichols wrote his letter to William Miller, Bates published his first little book, *The Opening Heavens*. It contained a ringing endorsement of Crosier's view about the heavenly sanctuary published in the February 7 *Day-Star*. With equal emphasis Bates rejected the "spiritualizing" of the sanctuary then going on among Enoch Jacobs' followers. Bates specifically opposed the idea that "God is in one place as in another"²³ and that Christ's second advent occurred among the Shakers.²⁴

Bates' *Opening Heavens* said nothing about the preadvent judgment. We note, however, that it had much to say about the "fiery trial" and "Daniel's trouble" ([Dan 12](#)) that commandment keepers must endure prior to the completion of the sealing work ([Rev 7](#)) and God's departure from Zion ([Joel 3](#)). When the sealing work is finished, Bates said, citing [Joel 3:16–17](#), Jerusalem will be "holy," cleansed from every impurity.²⁵ He would cite [Joel 3](#) and employ the theme of preadvent experiential trial and cleansing in almost every subsequent work.

Like his first book, Bates' second one—*The Seventh-day Sabbath, A Perpetual Sign* (August 1846)—made no mention of the heavenly judgment; but its second edition (January 1847) contained important revisions, in one of which Bates referred to the Millerite proclamation of the first angel's message as having been given "at the hour of his judgment."²⁶ Bates also referred to the seventh trumpet of [Revelation 11](#) and called attention to [Revelation 11:19](#), "the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament" (KJV). The ark of the testament is the ark that contains the Ten Commandments. Bates suggested tentatively that there might be a connection between Christ's 1844 entry into the Most Holy Place and the impressive new interest in the Sabbath commandment that had developed since 1844.²⁷

But Bates' main interest in this book, as in his first one, was in the "mighty struggle" that will "test every living soul" in relation to the Sabbath question, and in the effectiveness of the Sabbath to prepare living saints for the Second Coming.²⁸

Bates' proposal of a link between the new Sabbath emphasis and Christ's new work of cleansing the sanctuary was confirmed in his mind on March 6 and April 3, 1847, when Ellen White received two similar visions—the first one in his presence—portraying Jesus as standing since 1844 in the Most Holy Place calling attention specifically to the Sabbath commandment.

A month after the second of these visions Bates produced his third little book, *Second Advent Way Marks and High Heaps* (May 1847). His purpose once more was to persuade Adventists to keep the Sabbath holy in preparation for the Second Coming. His title reveals that part of his argument lay in restoring confidence in 1844 by reviewing evidence ("way marks and high heaps") that God had led the Millerite movement. Concluding from the evidence that God had truly led the Millerites, Bates affirmed²⁹ that at the climax of their movement, that is, in 1844, Jesus riding "in his cloudy chariot," came before the great God in "the height of his sanctuary." In his new official situation Jesus urgently calls attention to the fourth commandment. Bates' texts included [Daniel 7:13](#) and [Revelation 11:19](#).³⁰

As for the preadvent judgment, in this book Bates showed from the very scheme of things that the Second Coming could not have occurred at the close of the 2300 days in 1844 as the Millerites had hoped it would. "There must be order and time," he explained, for two essential things to take place between 1844 and the end of the world: "[1] for God in his judicial character to decide the cases of all the righteous that their names may be registered in the Lamb's book of life, and [2] they be fully prepared for that eventful moment of their change from mortal to immortality."³¹

This first clear reference of Bates' to the preadvent judgment was unlabored, even matter-of-fact. He made no attempt to prove it; rather, he used it as one of the two factors that explain the delay of the Second Coming. In Bates' mind the preadvent judgment was an intrinsic inescapable aspect of Christ's new sanctuary ministry.

Time, Bates said, is needed for the judgment. Time is also needed for the saints to prepare fully for "their change [that is, their translation] from mortal to immortality."

Heavenly and earthly activities (judgment of the saints, preparation of the saints) were once more viewed in parallel. And because Bates' basic burden in this work as before was to persuade people to keep the Sabbath, he once more provided little information about the preadvent heavenly judgment as such. His main emphasis lay on the preadvent experiential trial of the saints during their "waiting, trying" time after the Great Disappointment.

Employing wedding and Day of Atonement imagery, Bates perceived in the current "universal and peculiar trials" of the Advent people the "perfect antitype to the 10th day of the 7th month affliction" of [Leviticus 16](#) and [23](#). These earthly trials, provide a dual experiential cleansing parallel to the post-1844 heavenly cleansing. By them the earnest saints are cleaned up, and the heedless saints among them are cleaned out; that is, while the virgins wait for their High Priest to cleanse the sanctuary and finish the atonement,³² their trials "purge" them and "fan out the chaff from the wheat."³³ "If they endure them patiently," said Bates, these trials of the saints during this interval³⁴ "will fit them for the marriage supper" that follows the Second Coming, when Jesus appears to execute judgment.³⁵

The King is examining His guests, both good and bad. He is looking to see if they are wearing the linen garment, the righteousness of saints. The guests who lack the garment are those whose "sacrifice and obedience" are "incomplete."³⁶ But those whose characters, sacrifice, and obedience develop sufficiently under trial and through Sabbathkeeping will be sealed. All the "remnant" at the end of time will be Sabbathkeepers.³⁷

Bates' fourth book dealt principally with the Sabbath question, as its title indicates: *A Vindication of the Seventh-day Sabbath and the Commandments of God*. Issued in January 1845, it is of special value today for the insights it provides into the state of Sabbatarian Adventist teachings immediately prior to the famous 1848 Conferences.

As for the preadvent judgment, in *A Vindication* Bates again cited [Daniel 7](#) and [8](#), and the first angel's message, and also referred to the seventh trumpet. He referred to the "all absorbing subject of Christ coming to Judgment"³⁸ and said that the first angel's message was appropriately preached in the early 1840s "for the judgment was at hand."³⁹ We see again that the preadvent judgment was so intrinsically a part of the sanctuary concept that Bates felt no obligation to prove it.

But as before, Bates' interest in persuading people to keep the Sabbath led him in *A Vindication* to devote much more space to the earthly than to the heavenly trial of the saints. He used the familiar wedding and Day of Atonement imagery, but this time with an even sharper emphasis on the preparation of the saints, on their being perfected and sealed.⁴⁰ Happily he also provided promises of Christ's priestly part in this preparation,⁴¹ purifying His people and blotting out their sins. For example, he said:⁴²

This simultaneous sealing of the 144,000 will show such a clear development of Christian character in their lives and shining foreheads (or faces,) that it will be clearly understood that Jesus has redeemed them from all iniquity, by purifying "unto himself a peculiar people, ZEALOUS OF GOOD WORKS." (These good works, methinks, will be something more than simply saying we believe the Lord is coming.) Yes, says Malachi, when by his prophetic spirit, he saw Jesus "making up his jewels," at this point of time, then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked, ...

This sealing process, then, I understand to be going on with the little flock, progressing in accordance with the last eight years' peculiar labor in their experience [that is, since late 1839, when Miller began to labor in cities], and will be completed and approbated by God in the agonizing time of Daniel's and Jacob's trouble, and proclaimed to the world by God's roaring out of Zion, and uttering his voice from Jerusalem.

When Bates said that the preparation of the saints involves "something more than simply saying we believe the Lord is coming," he revealed that he thought nominal Adventists needed to grow into solid, mature Christians. When he said that the sealing process "will be approbated by God in the agonizing time of Daniel's and Jacob's trouble," he revealed that he had judgment as well as salvation in mind.

While Christ our great high priest, "in this day of atonement" is "cleansing the sanctuary, (blotting out his people's sins,) preparing his jewels ([Mal. 3:7](#))," Bates said His people are "in their trial" as foretold in [Revelation 14:12](#). Further developing the parallel cleansing concept, Bates again (p. 27) offered an explanation for the Second Advent delay: The reason that the antitypical day of atonement is longer than 24 hours "is obvious," he said, "because God will give his people sufficient time to accept or refuse the light presented to them ... by voluntarily entering into this Sabbath."⁴³

In *A Vindication*, Bates related the seal of God ([Rev 7](#)) to character development. At the final 1848 Conference, an informal gathering held in Dorchester, Massachusetts, in November, Ellen White commissioned Bates to produce a further booklet, this time showing that the Sabbath itself and not just the character development associated with Sabbath-keeping is the seal of God. Thus a third January witnessed the birth of a Bates publication.

A Seal of the Living God (January 1849), like most of its predecessors, dealt with the special significance of the Sabbath. It contained little about the preadvent judgment, but what it did say proved later to have been pivotal.

In *A Seal* Bates developed the argument that the sealing work was going on right then, "in the year 1849" (see the full title). To add conviction and urgency, Bates referred⁴⁴ to the startling 1848 revolution that had broken out recently in Europe, citing it as proof that the seventh trumpet had truly begun to sound: "These things without any doubt are in their progress and order the fulfillment of prophecy, viz: 'The nations are angry, thy wrath has come.'—[Rev. 11:18](#). The seventh angel HAS sounded, 15th verse. 'The time of trouble such as never was,' [Dan. 12:1](#), has begun; ..."

Elsewhere⁴⁵ Bates invoked the seventh trumpet again and stated emphatically, "The sealing is for the living saints only. The dead saints are now being judged, [Rev. 11:18](#)." The dead saints who "are now being judged," Bates said, included all the righteous persons from Abel to the resurrection. At the Second Coming they will be united with the 144,000 living saints who are now being sealed. Bates limited the preadvent judgment to saints only⁴⁶ by employing the familiar breastplate-of-judgment argument, namely, that the breastplate worn by the high priest when he went in before the Lord on the Day of Atonement carried the names only of members of the house of Israel.

Bates was certain that "the dead saints" were "now being judged" because [Revelation 11:18](#), a verse in the seventh trumpet, speaks about both the anger of the nations and the arrival of the time to judge the dead. If the 1848 revolution proved that the anger of the nations had begun, then, Bates reasoned, it also proved that the time had come to judge the dead. Perceiving this judgment of the dead to be the preadvent judgment of the saints, and completely confident of his understanding of the 1848 revolution, Bates in this work—*A Seal of the Living God*—did not bother to make use of [Daniel 7](#) and [8](#). For him at this time, coupling the 1848 Revolution to [Revelation 11:18](#) offered sufficient evidence.

It must have come as quite a surprise to him, when in the very month this book appeared (January 1849) Ellen White—who had asked him to write the book in the first place—had a vision in which, she indicated later, she had seen that a judgment of the saints was now in progress but that the anger of the nations and the particular judgment spoken of in the seventh trumpet were still in the future.

I was taken off in vision to the most holy place, where I saw Jesus still interceding for Israel.... I saw that Jesus would not leave the most holy place until every case was decided [a reference to the preadvent judgment] either for salvation or destruction, and that the wrath of God could not come until Jesus had finished His work in the most holy place, laid off His priestly attire, and clothed Himself with the garments of vengeance.... I saw that the anger of the nations, the wrath of God, and the time to judge the dead were separate and distinct, one following the other, also that Michael had not stood up, and that the time of trouble, such as never was, had not yet commenced. The nations are now getting angry, but when our High Priest has finished His work in the sanctuary, He will stand up, put on the garments of vengeance, and then the seven last plagues will be poured out.⁴⁷

It was Bates' overuse and misuse of the seventh trumpet in connection with the preadvent judgment that was pivotal. It became the occasion for Ellen White's vision, and her vision had the effect among Sabbatarian Adventists of terminating the use of [Revelation 11:18](#) as a reference to the investigative judgment.

Bates took the vision seriously. When he returned to the subject of the preadvent judgment in *An Explanation of the Typical and Antitypical Sanctuary* (summer? 1850), he also returned to the broadly based Bible arguments he himself had used earlier and that had been used immediately following the Great Disappointment, such as [Daniel 7](#) and [8](#), [Leviticus 16](#) and [23](#), the wedding imagery, and the first angel's messages.⁴⁸

In his *Antitypical Sanctuary*⁴⁹ Bates urged strongly for the presence of God in the *holy place* of the heavenly sanctuary prior to 1844, a concept defended in the December 30, 1844, *Day-Star*, visualized in Ellen Harmon's Bridegroom vision of February 1845, and implied by Otis Nichols in his letter to William Miller, April 20, 1846. Bates cited in evidence passages from [Exodus 29](#) and [30](#) and [Revelation 3–5](#):

The Ancient of Days (God) sets between the Cherubims, in the Most Holy Place. This is where he is sought unto when the National Atonement is made. Where then is His THRONE during the daily ministration? Ans.—In the type. See [Exo. 29:42–44](#), and [30:6](#), [36](#). In the anti-type Jesus says he sets on his Father's Throne, [Rev. 3:21](#). John in vision sees the throne in the Holy Place where the seven lamps of fire are. See [Rev. 4:1](#), [2](#) and [5: 5](#), [7](#). God is thereon.

In the 16 small pages of the *Antitypical Sanctuary* Bates did not have space to develop again his understanding of the preadvent experiential trial and purification of the saints, though he did make passing reference to the saints' afflictions and, of course, mentioned the new relevance of the Sabbath in view of Christ's opening up the Most Holy Place in 1844 ([Rev 11:19](#)). The most characteristic passage in this little document is its statement about the onset of the preadvent judgment. Though somewhat extensive, this statement deserves reproduction here as representing Bates' mature thinking and because its content became normative for Seventh-day Adventists for a long time.⁵⁰

DANIEL 7:9, 10, 13, shows how the Bridegroom *came*, viz: I beheld till the thrones were cast down and the Ancient of Days [God the Father] did sit. Where? In Judgment; between the Cherubims' wings, over the Mercy Seat, where he always set to judge his people, on the 10th day of the 7th month.⁵¹

The flying Angel in Heaven and swift Messengers on earth, had just finished their message, crying with a loud voice, "the hour of His judgment is come." Where Daniel saw this, [[Daniel 7:9](#)] [10](#).

Then one like the Son of Man, (Bridegroom) is brought near before Him, (the Father,) where he sets in Judgment.

This is how the Bridegroom comes, not to earth, but to the Father, just as it was in the type: Jesus is represented *like* the son of man. When he descends to earth it is the Lord himself.

I have already adduced the proof that Jesus was setting with his Father on his throne in the Holy, where the seven lamps of fire were. Then at the appointed time, 2300 days, the Ancient of Days moves in something that has wheels burning like fire, with thousands of angels in attendance. Then one like the son of man is brought near before him, [[Daniel 7:13](#)] verse, ... How evident that both Father and Son here left the throne in the Holy and moved into the Most Holy, in accordance also with, and close of, the message of the flying angel in [Rev. 14:6](#), [7](#) to set in judgment; first to decide who is, and who is not worthy to enter the gates of the holy city; while the Bridegroom, High Priest, Mediator and crowned King of Israel stands before him advocating the cause of all presented on his breast plate of judgment. As Daniel sees it, the judgment is now set and the books open.

Summary

Now to recapitulate briefly. This study so far has shown that the Seventh-day Adventist concept of a preadvent judgment is based on [Daniel 7](#) and [8](#), the Day of Atonement, wedding parable imagery, and many other biblical data. It was perceived embryonically as early as 1840; then, immediately following the Great Disappointment it was tied to Christ's 1844 entry into the Most Holy Place and also to the need of disappointed Adventists to remain faithful and not backslide.

Thus developed, the concept was soon abandoned by its principal early advocates. It was retained and amplified by the Sabbatarian Adventists, however, who perceived the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) to be the one in heaven and who came to see a connection between Christ's 1844 entrance into the Most Holy Place and the revealing of the "ark of his testament" ([Rev 11:19](#)) under the seventh trumpet. Linking "sanctuary" with "Sabbath" provided vital dynamics for both concepts.

Crosier advanced the idea that while the heavenly sanctuary is being cleansed there is a parallel cleansing of the church sanctuary on earth. Bates, as the principal author among the Sabbatarian Adventists from 1846 to 1850, developed the conviction that the trials endured by Sabbathkeeping Adventists paralleled and were significant to the judicial trial of the saints going on in heaven. Those persons who endured these earthly trials and entered fully into Sabbathkeeping would, he said, receive the seal of God and be approved in the judgment.

Ellen White's visions seemed to endorse most of what Bates had to say, though when Bates used [Revelation 11:18](#) to time the onset of the preadvent judgment, a vision of hers nudged him away to other Bible evidences.

James White and the Investigative Judgment

James White was so closely associated with Joseph Bates in the formation of Seventh-day Adventist doctrine and organization that the two of them, along with some others, are described as cofounders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It was James White who, in January 1857, published the term "investigative judgment" by which the preadvent judgment since has been principally known among Seventh-day Adventists.

Rejects Preadvent Judgment (1850)

It comes as a surprise, then, to learn that in September 1850, shortly after the appearance of Bates' work cited at the end of the previous section, James White publicly rejected the preadvent judgment. "Some have contended that the day of judgment was prior to the second advent," he said. "This view is certainly without foundation in the word of God."⁵³

White's opposition was not new in 1850. Three years earlier, in *A Word to the "Little Flock"*⁵³ he had discussed the millennial judgment of [Revelation 20](#). The saints will sit on thrones of judgment for a thousand years, he observed; and inasmuch as [2 Peter 3:8](#) says that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years" (KJV), he reasoned that the day of judgment would extend throughout the millennium.

Opposing even Josiah Litch's classic argument, White said in 1847 that God does not need to judge the dead prior to the Second Coming resurrection because "the names of the saints are [already] written in heaven." "The wicked are not sentenced before Christ comes," he continued, "but will hear their sentence after they are raised, at the close of the 1000 years." The "execution of the final judgment on all the wicked" will take place when the fire falls after the resurrection of the wicked dead at the end of the millennium.

Bates and White in Agreement

But the difference between Bates and White in September 1850 should be placed in context with their deep-seated agreement. The men were, after all, excellent friends and deeply committed to the same cause. Both of them staked everything on the fundamental conviction that the 2300 days ended in October 1844 with Christ's entry into the Most Holy Place to cleanse the sanctuary.

We already know what Bates was saying. Here is White in December 1850 on the 2300 days as a landmark or pillar of faith:

THE 2300 DAYS.—This prophetic period has been, and still is, the main pillar of the Advent faith. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that we have a correct view of the commencement and termination of this period, in order to understand our present position.⁵⁴

On the same theme he had stated in May:

Since the 2300 days ended in 1844, quite a number of times have been set, by different individuals, for their termination. In doing this they have removed the "landmarks," and have thrown darkness and doubt over the whole advent movement.⁵⁵

And here is White in the *Review* for June 9, 1851, discussing the significance of 1844:

On the day of atonement for cleansing the earthly Sanctuary, the high priest bore into the Holiest, upon the breast-plate of judgment, the names of all Israel that could be benefited by the tenth day atonement. Thus our High Priest bore in, on the tenth day of the seventh month, 1844, all that had not rejected light and truth sufficient to be cut off from Israel.... We believe in a literal Christ in a literal Sanctuary.⁵⁶

Thus in June 1851, White agreed with Bates not only on the importance of 1844, the cleansing of the sanctuary, and Christ's breastplate-of-judgment ministry, but also in applying the wedding parable imagery to the post-1844 experience of the Adventists. Indeed, he was so closely in agreement with Bates that he believed the King was even then examining the marriage guests and also that the trials associated with the Sabbath question constituted a kind of judgment on earth:

As we are now in the time of the marriage, we may expect a message to be given, that will test and try those who have been called out.... The work of this message will compare with the examination of the guests in the marriage. And we believe that the third angel's message [principally about the Sabbath] is just such a test, by which the guests are now being examined. If there had been no danger of some losing their garments in this trying time, in which the saints were to wait for the return of the Lord from the wedding, then there would have been no need of the caution. "Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame. [Rev. 16:15](#)."⁵⁷

Thus, in spite of his 1847 contention that God already knew the names of the saints and his 1850 remark that a preadvent "day of judgment" was "without foundation in the word of God" by June 1851 James White at least did believe in a preadvent judgment of sorts. The living saints, he indicated, were being even then examined by the King through the preaching of the Sabbath message and, as a consequence, some of the saints would be found ultimately to have lost their garments.

White also agreed with Bates in holding to a two-phase final judgment consisting of a trial and an execution. So where did they disagree? Whereas Bates talked about a preadvent judgment of the saints by God, followed by an executive day of judgment at the Second Advent, White spoke about the judgment of the wicked by the saints during the thousand years, followed by the execution of judgment at the end of that period.

Both men based their understanding on the Bible, and in actual fact, neither man's view contradicted the other's. In time, the two men realized that their concepts were complementary.⁵⁸

Argues for Preadvent Judgment (1857)

At some point White conceded the validity of Litch's basic argument, which in 1847 he had specifically denied, namely, that trial judgment must precede resurrection. With two resurrections to deal with, one at the Second Coming and the other at the close of the thousand years, White came to see that there was room for pre-resurrection trial judgments. He wrote in January 1857:

Both classes [the righteous and the ungodly] will be judged before they are raised from the dead. The investigative judgment of the house, or church, of God will take place before the first resurrection; so will the judgment of the wicked take place during the 1000 years of [Rev. 20](#), and they will be raised at the close of that period.

This statement involving two trial judgments comes from White's famous article, "The Judgment,"⁵⁹ in which he popularized the term "investigative judgment" which had appeared in print for the first time on January 1 in a letter from Elon Everts. Deeply convinced, White cried out, "In this awful hour, either sins or names will be blotted out.... O church of Christ awake! awake! The judgment is passing."

To document this 1857 appeal, White employed the familiar arguments supportive of the preadvent judgment based on [Daniel 7](#) and [8](#), the Day of Atonement, the breastplate of judgment, [Malachi 3](#), and [1 Peter 4:17](#) that his brethren had been using for years.

Indeed, in January 1857 James White was so plainly committed to the evidence previously cited by his brethren that we are curious to know whether he adopted their conclusions earlier than 1857. A definitive answer eludes us. Some strong hints can be discerned by examining his choice of articles as editor of the *Adventist Review* in 1850 and as principal editor of the *Review and Herald* between 1850 and 1855. What concepts did he select to publish under the names of other Adventist writers?

From January 23 to May 1, 1855, White ran a series by J. N. Andrews, "Three Angels of Rev. 14:6–12," in which Andrews said nothing for or against a preadvent judgment but in which he ambiguously related the first angel's "hour of his judgment" to the Second Coming⁶⁰ while expressly stating that it marked the close of the prophetic periods prior to the Second Coming.⁶¹ (White himself in his November 29, 1853, issue seemed to relate the first angel's message of judgment to the Second Coming.)⁶²

On the other hand, however, a few months after Andrews' serial ended, White published an article in the October 2, 1865, issue by future editor Uriah Smith that claimed that the judgment of [Daniel 7](#) began in 1844. This was 15 months before White's January 1857 article on the judgment. And nearly three years before that 1857 article, in the issue for February 14, 1854, White published an article by J. N. Loughborough stating that the judgment that the first angel heralded began in 1844. It is highly significant that White introduced this Loughborough article with an editorial note: "We shall be pardoned for inserting the following in the REVIEW, though not written for publication; as it meets inquiries which have been presented to us."

Furthermore, on January 10, 1854, White released an article by Elon Everts which said that "light on the Sanctuary shows that the judgment commenced on the tenth of the 7th month, at the end of the 2300 days."

Is it possible that White had accepted the concept of a preadvent judgment by the beginning of 1854? Or had he done so perhaps even earlier?

On December 20, 1850, White interrupted a short series of his own dealing with the current doctrinal position of the Sabbatarian Adventists in order to make room for an article by Joseph Bates. In this article Bates characteristically portrayed Jesus since 1844 wearing the breastplate of judgment and called on Adventists to afflict their souls, "for the judge stands before the door." Encouragingly, Bates affirmed that "the precious promise of the Bridegroom to all such [that is, to all who now afflict their souls] is, 'Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I ALSO WILL KEEP THEE.' &c. Amen."

Bates added: "This is the state of the Israel of God, and must be until the house of God is judged, [1 Peter 4:17](#), and fitted for deliverance."

And even earlier, in September 1850, the month in which White opposed Bates respecting the preadvent judgment, White published an *Advent Review Extra* written by Hiram Edson. Addressing himself to non-Sabbatarian Adventists as constituting the Laodicean church, Edson did not mention the preadvent judgment as such, but he did speak of Christ's 1844 entry into the Most Holy Place wearing the breastplate of judgment, and warned, in Day of Atonement language, that, like rebellious Israelites of old,⁶³ "so also now those who have not kept their garments, but lost them, ... instead of their sins being blotted out, their names will be blotted out of the book of life, and they will be cut off from the house of Israel forever."⁶⁴

Now, Edson's 1850 language, warning that names instead of sins might be blotted out, was virtually the same language that James White used at one point in his 1857 article as quoted a moment ago: "In this awful hour, either sins or names will be blotted out." But in 1857 White expressly added, "O church of Christ awake! awake! the judgment is passing."

It is most noteworthy that, like Edson's 1850 article, White's in 1857 was addressed to Laodiceans. White's 1851 article, which we quoted on page 146 to demonstrate his basic agreement with Bates, was also addressed to Laodiceans and, like the 1857 article, called on them to wake up. However, in 1857 White had a different group of Laodiceans in mind. He in 1851 and Edson in 1850 wrote to the Adventists who were refusing to keep the Sabbath. His 1857 article was part of his then-current campaign to convince the Sabbatarian Adventists that in spite of their Sabbathkeeping, even *their* spiritual condition had become Laodicean. He told them that the Laodicean message was a "call of the dear Saviour" to lead Adventists to seek the Lord with all their hearts in preparation for the judgment then in progress.

Pastoral concern ultimately prompted White to stress the contemporaneity of the heavenly judgment, just as earlier it had influenced Jacobs, Turner, Miller, and others to do the same.

Reasons for Change

If eventually, then why not sooner? One explanation for White's delay in explicitly espousing the preadvent judgment lies in his preoccupation with the millennium. As early as 1845, a year after E. R. Pinney had done so but long before any other Adventist leader did, White became convinced that the saints would spend the thousand years in heaven rather than on earth, and that they would spend it judging the wicked.⁶⁵ Understanding the millennium is important, and we can sympathize with White in his determination to get his view across.

Another reason for White's reluctance specifically to teach the preadvent judgment under his own name probably lies in his preoccupation for years with winning Adventists to the Sabbath of the third angel's message. His task seemed to become increasingly difficult after 1849. In that year, it appears,⁶⁶ the majority of Adventists began to say that the first angel's message had not been fulfilled in the Millerite movement. This was, of course, a direct denial of what they had all once believed. To White, their new attitude seemed to stem from a desire to avoid the Sabbath implications of the third angel's message.

In order to show that the third angel's message was truly being fulfilled in the current Sabbatarian Adventist proclamation, James White found it essential to summon the non-Sabbatarian Adventists to a renewal of their confidence in the historical fulfillment of the first two angels. In order to do *this*, he naturally interpreted the first angel's message as closely as possible to the way most of the Adventists had interpreted it during the Millerite movement, that is, as applying to the final judgment at the Second Coming without reference to a preadvent phase. To have said much at this time about the preadvent judgment might have defeated his larger purpose.

But by 1857 circumstances had changed. White's concept of mission had expanded far beyond the ranks of former Millerites. And his pastor's heart revealed to him that even keeping the Sabbath, when done only nominally, is insufficient for "keeping one's garments spotless."

In 1856 and 1857 James White turned his primary attention momentarily from evangelistic to pastoral concerns. As he did so, the importance of the heavenly as well as the earthly trials of the saints occupied his attention.

Besides, in the Laodicean message itself he found a portrayal of the heavenly preadvent judgment. Jesus tells the members of the last-day church that unless they repent He will spew them out of His mouth. "Life and death are in this judgment call of the dear Saviour."

A third reason for James White's delay in personally advocating the preadvent judgment in the Review may lie in his assumed understanding of his wife's visions of January 5, 1850, and September 1850.⁶⁷ In these visions, she reported later, Ellen White was shown that the particular judgment which is mentioned under the seventh trumpet still lay in the future (this in correction of Joseph Bates), that the saints would judge the wicked during the thousand years, and that the execution of the judgment of the wicked would occur at the end of that period. Inasmuch as these visions endorsed James White's millennial concepts and reproved Bates for one of his favorite arguments in support of the preadvent judgment, White would have been less than human if he had not assumed that the visions proved Bates' position on the heavenly preadvent judgment completely wrong.

White overlooked this statement from the 1849 vision: "Jesus would not leave the most holy place until every case was decided either for salvation or destruction." And he evidently forgot that the Bridegroom vision of February 1845 was a version of [Daniel 7](#), with Jesus going to the Father at judgment time in 1844, as Otis Nichols and others perceived it to be. In the 1851 article referred to twice above, in which White agreed in many ways with Bates, White said nothing about [Daniel 7](#); but immediately following that article, on the same page, he began a study on [Daniel 7](#) in which he proved that Christ's coming to the Father occurred in 1844, but in which he went on to say, on the strength of the seventh trumpet—and evidently, of his understanding of his wife's visions—that all of the judgment was yet future.

We may not know for certain how long or for what reasons White hesitated to champion the preadvent judgment, but we do know that he advocated it strongly in January 1857—and that he believed it fervently thereafter. In his autobiographical *Life Incidents*, published in 1868, he affirmed that Seventh-day Adventists

solemnly believe that it was the design of God that definite time should be proclaimed, and that the 2300 days reached to the Judgment, referred to in the words of the first angel, "Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his Judgment is come." ... The grandeur of the sitting of the great court of Heaven in the investigative Judgment is described by the prophet thus [[Daniel 7:9, 13, 14](#) quoted].⁶⁸

Summary

This section of our study has shown that in 1850 James White opposed the heavenly preadvent judgment espoused so effectively by Joseph Bates. It has also shown that White and Bates were in thorough agreement on the 1844 termination of the 2300 days, the cleansing since then of the heavenly sanctuary, the current examination of the wedding guests by the King, and the trial of Adventists on the Sabbath question as being a kind of earthly preadvent judgment. Even though White did not personally author an article favoring the heavenly preadvent judgment until 1857 (at which time he popularized the term "investigative judgment"), he published other people's articles favoring that position as early as 1850 and he specifically endorsed such an article by J. N. Loughborough in February 1854.

White was justifiably concerned to help his Adventist brethren understand the millennium and accept the Sabbath. And he may also have misunderstood some of his wife's visions. But when he came to see that the millennial judgment is an addition to and is not in conflict with the preadvent judgment, and when he realized that even the Sabbatarian Adventists needed thorough revival and reformation, he preached the Laodicean message to them in an "investigative judgment" context. He continued to attach great significance to the investigative judgment throughout his life.

The Role of Ellen White

It may be helpful to consider briefly two questions asked about Ellen White's role in the development of the doctrine we are discussing: (1) Did Ellen White originate the concept of the investigative judgment? and (2) Did she simply acknowledge it in her early days and later separate herself from it?

The first question has been answered by the evidence already presented in this chapter. The basic features of the investigative judgment circulated in print before Ellen White experienced visions relating to it. She did not originate it.

The second question requires a slightly more complex response at this time. We have seen that in her February 1845 Bridegroom vision⁶⁹ Ellen White viewed Jesus as having entered the Most Holy Place in 1844 to marry His kingdom and as having warned His followers at the time to keep their garments spotless.⁷⁰ We have seen that in January 1849 she saw that Jesus would not leave the sanctuary until every case had been decided.⁷¹ In 1858 she referred to a judgment and a "special," "final" post-1844 "atonement" being conducted for the "righteous dead" and soon to be directed to the "righteous living."⁷² During the early years of the movement she spoke often about the Sabbath truth in terms of [Revelation 11:19](#), coming from Jesus in the Most Holy Place since 1844 as a decisive test separating true believers from nominal ones.⁷³ Repeatedly she called on Christians to live more constant, holy lives as essential for their salvation; urgently she pleaded with them to prepare for the time when they must live in the sight of a holy God without a priestly intercessor for sin.⁷⁴

In all these statements Ellen White was plainly in harmony with her brethren. When Bates tried to prove that the judgment began in 1844, on the basis of [Revelation 11:18](#), she opposed him; but she did not oppose him—or her husband, or Uriah Smith, or J. N. Loughborough—when they proved that it began in 1844 on the basis of [Daniel 7, 8](#) and [Leviticus 16](#).

Nonetheless, it is of more than passing interest that in her own articles and books Ellen White neither emphasized nor articulated in detail the investigative judgment concept until the 1880s, when she produced volume 4 of *The Spirit of Prophecy* (1884) and enlarged it into *The Great Controversy* (1888). Forty and more years after the Disappointment, she came out most clearly on the subject.⁷⁵

Now we must avoid misunderstanding. In *The Great Controversy* Ellen White assigned 11 chapters (18–28) to the question of the sanctuary, only one of which (28) was devoted to the investigative judgment. Five of these chapters dealt with the Millerite movement as a true fulfillment of prophecy, two dealt with the meaning of Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, two with the relationship between Christ's Most Holy Place ministry and the Sabbath question ([Rev 11:19](#)), and one with the inadequacy of "modern revivals." The trouble with modern revivals was shown to be their unbalanced emphasis on faith-alone and feelings, providing inadequate guidance toward the kind of faith-filled obedience required by the sanctuary-Sabbath and the investigative judgment. Only after presenting these 10 chapters did Ellen White take up the judgment aspect of Christ's post-1844 ministry in detail.

It has been suggested that in *The Great Controversy* Ellen White discussed the investigative judgment, not because she believed it, but because other pioneer Adventists had believed it and she wanted to justify their (immature) faith in 1844. But we have just reviewed the fact that she devoted five chapters to demonstrating that the Millerite movement was a genuine fulfillment of prophecy in its own right, and another four dealing with the spiritual and Sabbathkeeping implications of Christ's post-1844 Most Holy Place ministry. Those nine chapters provided a grand, even imposing, significance for the early Advent movement.

After saying so much else of importance about the meaning of the end of the 2300 days, why didn't Ellen White omit the investigative judgment from *The Great Controversy* if she didn't believe it? Why, if she didn't believe it, did she provide in that book her best-yet presentation of it?

To a careful reader of the 11 chapter sequence, the answer seems to be that the investigative judgment provided the indispensable climax to her own line of thought.

When *The Great Controversy* was published, Ellen White was 60 years of age, hardly a youngster experimenting with half-formed notions. In 1905, when she was nearing 80, she republished, in edited form, portions of *The Great Controversy* as periodical articles. Thus in the Review for November 9, 1905, we read, "Solemn are the scenes connected with the closing work of the atonement. Momentous are the interests involved therein. The judgment is now passing in the sanctuary above. *For more than sixty years* this work has been in progress" (emphasis supplied).

The phrase, "for more than sixty years," represents a refinement of the phrase, "for many years," found in *The Great Controversy*, page 490. "More than sixty years" takes us back 61 years, from 1905 to 1844.

Ellen White believed and taught the doctrine of the investigative judgment throughout her mature years.

Summary

Most Christians perceive the day of judgment as occurring only at the Second Coming. Seventh-day Adventists, however, say that the final judgment began when an investigation of all the professed people of God who have ever lived commenced in 1844. They perceive the date 1844 foretold in the “2300 evening-morning” prophecy of [Daniel 8:14](#). They see the judgment itself described in [Daniel 7](#) and demanded by numerous data in both Old and New Testaments, including not only [Daniel 7](#) and [8](#) but also the Day of Atonement in Leviticus, the wedding parables in the Gospels, and many others.

In 1840 Josiah Litch became the first American Adventist to write about a trial judgment preceding the Second Coming. A number of Millerites soon agreed with him, and after the Great Disappointment several Millerite editors published the belief that this trial judgment commenced in 1844. For awhile, Miller himself joined them. These leaders were partly motivated by pastoral concern for what seemed to them to be a rapid decline of spirituality among the Adventist people.

Soon Sabbatarian Adventists took over as proponents of the view, and among them, between 1846 and 1850, Joseph Bates was the principal writer. His publications reveal how the Sabbatarians linked Christ’s 1844 entry into the Most Holy Place with the Sabbath question in such a way that Sabbath observance was seen as essential to the blotting out of sins, and the earthly trials of Sabbathkeepers were seen as paralleling their heavenly trial judgment.

James White, though fully in harmony with most of what Bates wrote in this area, was reluctant to write explicitly about a preadvent heavenly judgment, being more interested at the time in the postadvent millennial judgment. By 1857, however, he had adopted the concept fully, and in January of that year he popularized the term “investigative judgment.”

Ellen White had no visions about the investigative judgment until after the concept of it circulated in Millerite periodicals. She favored most of what Bates wrote on the subject in the 1840s, but she provided her best account of it in the 1880s. Near the end of her life she indicated her continuing endorsement of it.

Seventh-day Adventist pioneers viewed the investigative judgment as constituting only one vital aspect of Christ’s post-1844 high priestly ministry. When discussing the judgment in its larger setting, they did so in a manner that was not only serious but also optimistic and encouraging, focusing often on victory and the blotting out of sins through Jesus Christ.⁷⁶

Addendum

An 1845 article by Millerite editor, Apollos Hale, reprinted in two parts by James White in the *Review* for September 16 and October 7, 1851, contributes helpfully to the above study.

The title of the original article was, “Has the Bridegroom Come?” In respect to the preadvent judgment it said that “the judiciary trial” precedes the execution of judgment, that the trial judgment “begins at the house of God,” and that Christ does not come to execute judgment until after the “judiciary trial and decision have been previously made by ‘the Father.’”

Hale’s article serves the argument of this chapter in two ways. First, it confirms what has been said about Hale’s belief, published in the *Advent Mirror* in January 1845, that the wedding involved judgment and that the judgment had begun. Second, it adds to what has been said about the likelihood that James White approved the heavenly preadvent judgment concept long before the appearance of his January 1857 article on the subject. In the September 16 *Review* he provided a half-column introduction to Hale’s material in which he took strong exception to two minor points but in which he otherwise recommended the article warmly. “It is well calculated,” he said, “to improve the faith and piety of those who are weak in the faith.” His nondisagreement with Hale’s remarks about the trial judgment is significant.

Hale’s article also corrects the above chapter in an interesting particular. It defends the metaphors that speak of Christ as marrying a bride, of the bride’s being the New Jerusalem, and of Christ’s making the bride ready. In the process, it identifies the anti-typical day of atonement with the purification of heavenly things ([Heb 9:23](#)) and with Christ’s post-1844 preparing of the New Jerusalem, that is, of the heavenly tabernacle. On February 7, 1846, Crosier’s article in the *Day-Star Extra* would make this multiple identification on a broadly argued base and go on to identify the purification of heavenly things with the cleansing of the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#). Hale’s article did not make that final identification. Hale apparently still believed that the cleansing of the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) would follow the trial judgment. But his article was a significant step toward that full identification. Hale wrote:

The “holy city” is called also “the tabernacle of God.”—[Rev. 21](#). Christ is “the minister of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man.”—[Heb. 7:2](#). The typical tabernacle had to be “purified;” and Paul tells us the true tabernacle must also be purified:—“It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; (the blood of calves and of goats;) but the *heavenly things themselves* with better sacrifices than these.”—[Heb. 9:23](#). The typical work of “atonement for the holy sanctuary, and for the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar;” as well as for “the priests, and for all the people of the congregation,” was on the tenth day of the seventh month.—[Lev. 16:29, 33](#). And when that work of atonement for “the heavenly things themselves” shall have been accomplished by Christ, then we suppose that preparation denoted in the figure will have been affected [sic]:—what had been hitherto the tabernacle of our Great High Priest is “ready to become his throne”

In concluding, I should like tardily to acknowledge great assistance at various points from P. Gerard Damsteegt’s *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission*, Grand Rapids, 1977.

Appendix A

William Miller's Use of the Word "Atonement"

Dalton D. Baldwin

As a boy attending Seventh-day Adventist church schools, the word "atonement" brought to my mind pictures of a priest casting lots over two goats, killing one of them, and using its blood in a dramatic ceremony in the Most Holy Place of the sanctuary. This ritual pointed forward to the 1844 entrance of Christ, our great high priest, into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary to begin the investigative judgment. The focus of the dramatic atonement action was on the priest's ministry before the mercy seat in the heavenly sanctuary.

I do not remember how old I was or the circumstances, but I vividly recall the shock when I learned that for most of the Christian world the word "atonement" focuses attention on the cross rather than upon the mercy seat. I found that the word "atonement" was used very differently in my childhood from the way it was used in the books I read when I was more mature. Was this difference the change from childish comprehension to that of maturity or was there a shift in the prevailing interpretation of the word in denominational usage?

The origin for this difference in Adventist usage is traceable in part to Miller's practice and in part to Sabbatarian understanding of Christ's Second Apartment ministry in heaven. Millerite preaching used the word "atonement" in a distinctive way. It was applied only to the work of the priest. In addition, a dominant use of the word "atonement" in early Sabbatarian Adventism made it equivalent with the investigative judgment that began in the heavenly sanctuary in 1844. Sporadically in the early period, and with increasing emphasis later, the word "atonement" was used to refer to the events which centered in and were completed on the cross.

Millerite Atonement

Apparently Miller felt that he would be more successful in recovering biblical Christianity if he dispensed with commentaries.¹ Perhaps his relative independence from scholarly Christian tradition helps to explain his rather unique usage of the word "atonement."

In his *Memoirs* Miller recorded for posterity a "brief statement of my faith" dated September 5, 1822. Several of the propositions in this statement refer to the atonement.

ART. V. I believe that God, knowing from eternity the use that man would make of his [free] agency, did, in his council of eternity, ordain that his Son should die; and that through his death salvation should be given to fallen man, through such means as God should appoint.

ART. VI. I believe that, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, sinners are made the recipients of mercy, in conformity to the Divine plan, founded on the wisdom and knowledge of God; the fruits of which are manifested in the recipient by works of repentance and faith; and without which no man, coming to years of discretion and able to choose between good and evil, can have an interest in the blood and righteousness of Christ.

ART. VII. I believe that Jesus Christ is an offering of God to sinners for their redemption from sin, and that those who believe in his name may take him by faith, go to God, and find mercy; and that such will in no wise be rejected.

ART. VIII. I believe that Jesus Christ was the sacrifice for sin which justice demanded; and that all those who confess their sins on the head of this victim, may expect forgiveness of sin through the blood of the atonement, which is in Jesus Christ, the great High Priest in the Holy of Holies.

ART. IX. I believe the atonement to be made by the intercession of Jesus Christ, and the sprinkling of his blood in the Holy of Holies, and upon the mercy-seat and people; by which means the offended is reconciled to the offender, the offender is brought into subjection to the will of God; and the effect is, forgiveness of sin, union to the Divine person, and to the household of faith.

ART. X. I believe all those for whom Christ intercedes, who are united to God by a living faith, and have received the forgiveness of sin through the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, can never perish; but are kept by the mighty power of God through faith unto salvation.²

Miller reported that he left this statement "for the inspection of my brethren, friends and children" and had made it "a subject of prayer and meditation."³ There is evidence that he carefully thought out the statement and intended that it should be used to describe his position. Let us turn to an analysis of its implications for the doctrine of the atonement.

Based on the Death of Christ

Although the atonement itself is an act of intercession, it is based on the death of Christ. Article V says that "through his death salvation should be given to fallen man." Jesus Christ "is an offering of God to sinners," according to Article VII. Here the direction of action which is intended to bring about change is from a loving God to the alienated sinner. This sacrifice was, nevertheless, one which "justice demanded" (Art. VIII). Notice that the blood of the atonement is located "in Jesus Christ, the great High Priest" and not spilled on the ground at the cross. The death of Christ is necessary as a condition for the atonement, but the blood of the atonement is in the heavenly sanctuary.

An editorial in the *Midnight Cry* further emphasized the need for the death of Christ as a foundation for the atonement. John Bunyan was cited to support the relation between death and mediation. "And having thus once offered his sacrifice without the veil, he is now gone into the holiest, to perfect his work of mediation for us."⁴ The editorial then quoted Macknight to bring out the importance of sacrifice for the purpose of atonement in heaven. Having "procured an eternal redemption for his people by the sacrifice of himself once offered," he then "made an atonement in heaven."⁵

Miller retained the distinction between necessary sacrifice on earth and atonement in heaven in a letter published in 1844 after the disappointment.

God seeing man in this deplorable condition provided a remedy in his Son Jesus Christ, and gave him to the world as an offering and a ransom for the world, and as without shedding of blood there could be no remission of sin; in due time Christ came into the world and shed his blood, and according to the typical law he that knew no sin became sin for us. Thus far he could not have saved one sinner, if this had been all that Christ had done.

Miller wanted to emphasize this point further:

Permit me now to make plain by questions and answers. Is not the offering and sacrifice of Christ the atonement? No. These are only preparatory steps, [Lev. 1:1–4; 4:13–20](#).

Then again in the same article he emphasized the importance of Christ's death while highlighting the intercession.

Instead then of the atonement being made at the death and sufferings of Christ, it is made by his life and intercession in heaven, [Heb. 7:25](#). His death and sufferings being only the sacrifice and offering, by which he is the propitiatory sacrifice to God, so that through his intercession we can be saved by his life, [Rom. 5:10; 1 John 5:11](#).⁶

He did not minimize the importance of the death, but he made it the foundation and precondition for the atonement that came later.

Atonement Made in Most Holy Place of the Heavenly Sanctuary

Sacrifice on the cross is made on earth. Atonement is made in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary. We have already noticed the statement in Article VIII which located the “blood of the atonement, which is in Jesus Christ, the great High Priest in the Holy of Holies.” Article IX also located the atonement in the Most Holy Place.

Other Millerites likewise placed the atonement in the Most Holy. Hotchkiss felt that Christ acted exclusively as prophet while on earth, as priest in the heavenly sanctuary, and will take up His kingly role only after His priestly work is finished.

The High Priest, when he was making the atonement, could not act in any other capacity, whilst engaged in that service. So Paul represents in his epistle to the Hebrews, that Christ is now engaged in his bodily form in the Holy of holies, doing this work for his people.⁷

Peavey called attention to the earthly service where, on the Day of Atonement, the high priest went “into the holy of holies, to make atonement or reconciliation for the people. See [Heb. 9:10–12](#), where the apostle presents this great work of reconciliation, which Christ our great High Priest has been performing since He entered the holiest of all, heaven itself....”⁸ Bunyan has already been quoted as locating mediation in the holiest.⁹ When Snow explained why he believed that Christ would come on the tenth day of the seventh month, he said that on that day Christ would complete His work of reconciliation and come out of the Most Holy Place. “The high priest was a type of Jesus our High Priest; the most holy place a type of heaven itself....”¹⁰ The same issue contained an editorial which said of Christ, “He put off his garments at his crucifixion, became a sin offering, and as our High Priest, entered once for all into the most holy place to make intercession with God for all his faithful followers.”¹¹

After the Great Disappointment Miller retained his conviction that atonement is made in the Most Holy Place. “Where is the atonement made? In the Most Holy Place, [Lev. 16:17](#), also [26](#), [31](#), [34](#) verses; [Luke 1:9–11](#); [Heb. 9:7–9](#) & [22–26](#).” In the same article he repeated with a slight variation, “Where is the atonement made? While the High Priest is in the holy place, [Lev. 16:27](#).¹²

Atoning Act Is Intercession

Miller used both the symbolic expression “sprinkling of his blood” and the word “intercession” to describe the atoning act of Jesus Christ in the heavenly sanctuary in Article IX. A change in God seems to be described when he says that the “offended is reconciled to the offender.” Atonement is partly an objective event which occurs outside of the sinner. Atonement is also a subjective transformation of the sinner. He is “forgiven” and brought into “union to the Divine person and to the household of faith.”

Hotchkiss understood that the atoning activity of Christ was mediation, in harmony with Miller’s view.

Christ, in this character, commenced his official work, at, or near the end of the 70 weeks; when he made the offering of himself as the sacrificial lamb; and who afterwards went into the Holy of holies as the intercessor, and Mediator of his people, and who will continue to officiate until the other portion of the 2300 days are all completed, when the sanctuary will be cleansed, or justified, and he, like Aaron after the Atonement was made, will come out to bless the people.—[Lev. 9:22](#).¹³

Peavey said that on the tenth day of the seventh month the high priest went into the Most Holy Place “to make atonement or reconciliation.”¹⁴ Bunyan was quoted as referring to atonement as “mediation” and as the work of Christ “now appearing in the presence of God for us.”¹⁵ Snow also referred to the atoning action as “reconciliation.”¹⁶

After the disappointment Miller reaffirmed his view that the atoning act requires the prior death of Christ as a basis for reconciliation.

The word *atonement*, signifies *reconciliation*, or *at-one-ment*, and is a work which Christ performs, our High Priest, so that God can forgive sin and receive the sinner into his favor as though he never had sinned. We then want to know how this is performed. I know of no better way than to examine the shadow which is contained in the typical law. There can be no atonement only where there is or has been sin, God is not displeased with his own work when it comes from his hand it is pronounced good. Therefore sin is produced by some other agent than God, and as sin is a transgression of the law, the agent must be a subject of law. Man is according to this reasoning the subject and agent I have described; for being made under the law, and by transgression has become obnoxious in the sight of God, unreconciled to God, and justly condemned. He cannot be reconciled to a holy God only by the atonement. God seeing man in this deplorable condition provided a remedy in his Son Jesus Christ, and gave him to the world as an offering and a ransom for the world, and as without shedding of blood there could be no remission of sin; in due time Christ came into the world and shed his blood, and according to the typical law he that knew no sin became a sin for us. Thus far he could not have saved one sinner, if this had been all that Christ had done. No; but like the High Priest under the law, he must take his life, or blood which is the life, [Lev. 18:11](#)—and must enter into the holy of holies, which is heaven, to appear in the presence of God for us, where he makes an atonement for us who come to God by him; therefore he that cometh to God must believe that he is our intercessor, and that he is a rewarder of all that diligently seek him.¹⁷

In Miller’s view there is clearly an atoning act of God objective to man which makes reconciliation available. Atonement does not seem to be complete for an individual, however, until there has been a personal response.

Atonement Is Received by Faith

Miller did not quite say that each individual must make a free decision of faith in order to receive the reconciliation of the atonement, but he did say that no one is reconciled who does not have faith. Bliss says that Miller’s “general theological opinions may be inferred from his connecting himself with a Calvinistic Baptist Church, as the one most congenial to his faith.”¹⁸

In his belief statement, Article III says that man was “created a moral agent, capable of living, of obeying, or transgressing the laws of his Maker.” Article IV says that after the Fall he “became polluted; from which act sin entered into the world, and all mankind became naturally sinners, thrust out from the presence of God, and exposed to his just wrath forever.” It would appear that man was free to choose to accept or reject relationship with God before the Fall but then lost this freedom at the Fall.

Article XVIII reads, “I believe in the doctrine of election, founded on the will, purpose and foreknowledge of God; and that all the elect will be saved in the kingdom of God, through the sanctification of the Spirit and the belief of the truth.”¹⁹ The emphasis on “will” and “purpose” suggests a God determinism. The word “fore-knowledge” could make room for a choice not caused by God but foreknown by God. Saying that salvation is brought about through “belief” could allow for a free decision. Miller’s appeals to accept Jesus Christ sound as if he believes the sinner has determining free agency.

Article VI states that it is the transforming activity of the Spirit in the individual which produces “conformity to the divine plan” and “works of repentance and faith.” These are essential conditions for “an interest in the blood and righteousness of Christ” which are mediated in the atoning act. Atonement includes a subjective response in the individual. Miller’s description of a person coming to years of discretion and able to choose between “good and evil” in this article suggests a genuinely free decision on the part of the agent whether to accept the offered reconciliation. Even if there is no free decision, it is clear that the divine creation of faith is necessarily present in the atoning act of reconciliation.

Article X teaches the assurance of salvation in that all for whom “Christ intercedes,” and therefore, all those who “are united to God by a living faith,” can “never perish, but are kept by the mighty power of God through faith unto salvation.” Faith is essential. After the disappointment Miller continued to teach that faith is required in the reception of the atoning reconciliation.

For whom is the atonement made? It is made for all who believe, confess their sins, or repent, which is the same thing in gospel sense, and come to God by, or through our High Priest. See type [Lev. 1:4](#), also [16:20–22](#); [Isa. 53:11](#), [12](#). [John 1:29](#); [Rom. 3:25](#); [2 Cor. 5:17–21](#); [1 John 1:7–9](#); [Gal. 1:4](#), & [2:20](#); [Heb. 2:17](#), & [7:25](#), & [9:24](#).²⁰

In the same published letter he seems to teach that the possible benefits of the atonement extend to every sinner. This unlimited atonement is not usually associated with a strict Calvinistic God determinism.

Can all men be atoned for? All men have a probation, and while in that probation might have an atonement if they would comply with the requirements of the gospel. The sacrifice and offering is sufficient for every individual of mankind; but none who need an atonement will ever be reconciled to God, but those who believe and repent.²¹

In this last statement Miller the evangelist is making an appeal. Everyone may be reconciled in the atoning act of Christ if he has faith during this short time remaining while probation continues.

From the Ascension to the End of the 2300 Days

Miller's early statement of belief does not contain any explicit reference to the time when the atonement occurs, but his description of atonement as intercession would suggest that it begins as soon as Christ begins His intercession in the heavenly sanctuary. His use of [Leviticus 16](#) and the Day of Atonement service in the interpretation of the meaning of the phrase "then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" would suggest that the atonement would cease by the end of the 2300 days. The 1822 belief statement suggests that this will occur by 1843. Article XV states, "I believe that the second coming of Jesus Christ is near, even at the door, even within twenty-one years—on or before 1843."²²

The expanded 1836 edition of Miller's *Evidence From Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ, About the Year 1843* discusses the end of atoning mediation. At one point he explains the meaning of the proclamation of the angel of [Revelation 10](#) that "there should be time no longer" as follows:

That is, gospel or mediatorial time should cease. No more time for mercy, no more Spirit to strive with you, sinner, no more means of grace, no more repentance unto life, no more hopes of heaven, for Jesus has sworn by himself, because he could swear by no one greater, that your day of probation "should be no longer." For "he that is filthy shall be filthy still." The bridegroom has come and shut the door. I know, sinner, you will then cry Lord, Lord, open unto us. But he will say unto you, depart from me ye workers of iniquity, for I know you not: when I called to you to open the door of your hearts, that I might come in and sup with you, ye refused. When I stretched out my arm all the long day of the gospel, ye regarded it not.²³

When the door is shut gospel time has ceased. Christ has stopped His atoning mediation. Later in the book, discussing the parable of the ten virgins, he says, "'The door was shut,' implies the closing up of the mediatorial kingdom, and the finishing of the gospel period."²⁴

Other Millerites expected that the mediation of Christ would close at the end of the 2300 days. It is evident, from the rhetorical question asked by F. G. Brown, that Millerites expected mediation to cease in the near future. "And if the doctrine that Christ is about to leave the mediatorial seat is calculated to lead to insanity, then should the doctrine of the final judgment be a proscribed theme, on the same ground."²⁵

In May of 1843 a letter from Miller to Himes was published in the *Signs of the Times*. He proposed that the spring ceremonies of the OT were fulfilled by the first coming of Christ and advanced 11 examples of evidence that the fall ceremonies could be fulfilled at the Second Advent. In two of these examples he says the following about the atonement:

8. The atonement was made on the tenth day seventh month, and this is certainly typical of the atonement Christ is now making for us. [Lev. 16:1–34](#), antitype. [Heb. 9:1–28](#).
9. When the high priest came out of the holy of holies after making the atonement, he blessed the people. [Lev. 9:22, 23](#); [2 Sam. 6:18](#). So will our great High Priest. [Heb. 9:28](#). This was on the seventh month tenth day.²⁶

Miller was quite tentative about these conclusions, but his confidence seemed to be increasing that mediation was almost completed. "Will you and brother Bliss examine and tell me what you think of my scribble on this point. If this should be true, we shall not see his glorious appearing until after the autumnal equinox. A few months more of trial and calumny, and then all will be over."²⁷ In this statement Miller seems to suggest that the end of the atoning process will occur in the fall because, as he says in item nine above, the atonement ends on the tenth day of the seventh month.

Peavey also felt that "atonement or reconciliation" had been in progress since Christ entered heaven at His ascension and set the time for finishing this work from the date of the typical atonement service. He expected Christ to "come out of the holiest of all, heaven itself; to bless and deliver his people. And when will it take place? Well, in order to fulfill every jot and tittle of the law, it must take place on the tenth day of the seventh month—the day of atonement or expiation."²⁸

We have already quoted extensively from Hotchkiss²⁹ where he said that Christ entered the Most Holy Place to make atonement after the end of the 70 weeks and His activity there will be completed by the end of the 2300 days. Most Millerites expected atonement to continue until just before the end of the 2300 days when Christ would return.

As Miller looked forward to the close of mediation, he expected that his own work would be completed. "But I feel almost confident that my labors are about done, and I am, with a deep interest of soul, looking for my blessed and glorious Redeemer, who will then be King over all the earth, and God with us for evermore."³⁰

James White quoted a letter from Miller to J. V. Himes written October 6, 1844, that said, "I am strong in the opinion that the next will be the last Lord's day sinners will ever have in probation. And within ten or fifteen days from thence, they will see Him whom they have hated and despised, to their own shame and everlasting contempt."³¹ Miller expected the Second Coming a short time after the cessation of mediation.

In what was expected to be the last issue of the Advent Herald there was an article by Snow explaining the reasons why he anticipated the Advent on the tenth day of the seventh month in 1844. In the article he said the following:

Now the *important point* in this type is the *completion* of the reconciliation at the *coming* of the high priest *out of* the holy place. The high priest was a type of Jesus our High Priest; the most holy place a type of heaven itself; and the coming of Jesus the second time to bless his waiting people. As this was on the tenth day of the 7th month, so on that day Jesus will certainly come, because not a *single point* of the law is to fail. *All must be fulfilled*.³²

The same issue of the paper contained an editorial which supported Snow by saying that we have "great reason" to expect on this day the "coming out from the inner sanctuary, of our great High Priest."³³

It is remarkable how many of the Millerite interpreters expected the atoning mediation of Christ to be completed on the tenth day of the seventh month and how few expected some new activity of the High Priest. We should be able to understand their reasoning if we realize that they understood that this atoning mediation had been going on since the ascension and should end about 1844. When they looked for a specific time in that year, it seemed that the tenth day of the seventh month would be a fitting day since the High Priest in the typical service came out of the Most Holy Place on that day.

We may summarize the Millerite concept of atonement with the following propositions: The death of Jesus Christ for sinful men is required by justice and is the basis for the atonement. Objective atoning action is located in the heavenly sanctuary and not on the cross on earth. Objective atoning action is intercession and mediation. The atoning action which is subjective to the sinner is received in faith. Atonement begins at the ascension and is completed by the end of the 2300 days.

Editor's Note

Failure to define the term "atonement" adequately has led to misunderstanding both within and without the Seventh-day Adventist Church. While most Christians have defined the word in terms of Christ's death, Sabbatarian Adventists followed Miller and defined it in terms of Christ's priestly intercession and later also of Christ's final ministry in the investigative judgment of the Most Holy Place. The essential argument was that only a priest could make atonement; hence, Christ could not make atonement until He became our high priest in heaven.

Time and continued clarification of the subject have enabled many Seventh-day Adventists to perceive the wider, biblical scope of the "atonement" concept. It involves three areas:

1. Atonement/reconciliation may be applied to Christ's death (the objective atonement). His death reconciled the world to God in the sense that it made expiation for sin ([Rom 5:10–11](#); [2 Cor 5:18](#)).
2. Atonement/reconciliation may be applied to Christ's priestly mediation of His merits. His intercession reconciles repentant sinners to God as taught by the type ([Lev 4:30–31](#)).
3. Atonement/reconciliation may be applied to the investigative judgment, the antitypical day of atonement that commenced in 1844. In this Second Apartment phase of Christ's priestly ministry He makes final atonement for His people by reaffirming all genuine believers—blotting out the records of their sins—and by bringing the sin problem to an end. This atonement by judgment (typified by the ritual of the Day of Atonement) reconciles or restores harmony once more to the universe ([Lev 16](#); [Eph 1:10](#)).

Appendix B

Ellen G. White's Use of Scripture to Explain the Sanctuary Doctrine*

P. Gerard Damsteegt

Significance of the Sanctuary Doctrine

[Daniel 8:14](#) was the most significant scriptural passage in the nineteenth century Second Advent movement. Ellen White comments, “The Scripture which above all others had been both the foundation and the central pillar of the Advent faith was the declaration, ‘Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed’ ”¹ Understanding the nature of the sanctuary solved the riddle of the great disappointment of October 22, 1844, for our pioneers.

“The subject of the sanctuary was the key which unlocked the mystery of the disappointment of 1844. It opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious, showing that God’s hand had directed the great Advent movement and revealing present duty as it brought to light the position and work of His people.”²

“The sanctuary in heaven,” Ellen White states, “is the very center of Christ’s work in behalf of men.”³ She highlights its importance by declaring that the “intercession of Christ in man’s behalf in the sanctuary above is as essential to the plan of salvation as was His death upon the cross.”⁴

Biblical Concept of the Sanctuary

The exegetical methods Ellen White employs as legitimate and biblically sound in expounding the sanctuary doctrine are primarily (1) a historicist hermeneutic of [Daniel 8](#) and [9](#), (2) year-day principle, (3) analogy of Scripture, (4) typological principle, (5) Scripture its own interpreter.

Evidence for the existence of a heavenly sanctuary or temple structure Ellen White finds in Hebrews, Revelation, and Exodus.

From the study of [Hebrews 8](#) and [9](#) and [Exodus 25:9, 40](#) she concludes that the Bible reveals the existence of two sanctuaries: (1) the earthly tabernacle being the sanctuary of the first covenant; (2) the “true tabernacle” ([Heb 8:2](#)) in heaven, the “new-covenant sanctuary.”⁵ The “first tabernacle” of [Hebrews 9:8](#) she interprets as the earthly sanctuary which was “a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices” ([Heb 9:9](#)).⁶ This sanctuary built by Moses was a “copy” of the heavenly sanctuary, the “great original.”⁷

She understood both the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary to have “holy places.” The “holy places” of the first were “patterns of things in the heavens” ([Heb 9:23](#)).⁸ She thus points out that the “holy places of the sanctuary in heaven are represented by the two apartments in the sanctuary on earth.”⁹

She found additional biblical support for this view in Revelation. John, she says, was “permitted to behold the first apartment of the sanctuary in heaven; and he saw there the ‘seven lamps of fire’ [[Rev 4:5](#)] and ‘the golden altar’ [[Rev 8:3](#)] represented by the golden candlestick in the altar of incense in the sanctuary on earth.”¹⁰ A view of the Second Apartment was revealed to the prophet when “the temple of God was opened” ([Revelation 11:19](#)), and he looked within the inner veil, upon the holy of holies. Here he beheld ‘the ark of His testament,’ represented by the sacred chest constructed by Moses to contain the law of God.”¹¹ These views on a bipartite sanctuary structure in heaven were earlier confirmed by a vision which revealed that (1) the furniture of the holy place and Most Holy Place of the earthly sanctuary was like that of the heavenly, and (2) Jesus ministered in both of these apartments.¹²

Although there were structural similarities between both sanctuaries it was clear to her that the dimensional differences were profound. “No earthly structure could represent its vastness and its glory,” she writes, because in the “heavenly temple, the abiding-place of the King of kings ... ‘thousand thousands minister unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him’ ” ([Dan 7:10](#)).¹³

She cites the above biblical data as an “indisputable proof of the existence of a sanctuary in heaven,” commenting, “Moses made the earthly sanctuary after a pattern which was shown him. Paul teaches that that pattern was the true sanctuary which is in heaven. And John testified that he saw it in heaven.”¹⁴

Sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#)

Ellen White interprets the “sanctuary” of [Daniel 8:14](#) as the heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant. Her hermeneutic for this view is the following: “As the prophecy of [Daniel 8:14](#) is fulfilled in this dispensation, the sanctuary to which it refers must be the sanctuary of the new covenant. At the termination of the 2300 days in 1844, there had been no sanctuary on earth for many centuries. Thus the prophecy, ‘Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed,’ unquestionably points to the sanctuary in heaven.”¹⁵

From this it can be concluded that she adheres to the historicist view of [Daniel 8](#) which accepts the year-day principle as a biblical datum, the little horn as pagan and papal Rome, and the 70 weeks of [Daniel 9](#) as forming the first part of the 2300 days.

Cleansing of the Sanctuary of Daniel 8:14

She saw the time for the cleansing of the sanctuary as beginning in the autumn of 1844. She notices NT evidence in [Hebrews 9](#) for the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary:

In [Hebrews 9](#) the cleansing of both the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary is *plainly taught*. ‘Almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no *remission*. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these [the blood of animals]; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these’ ([Hebrews 9:22, 23](#)), even the precious blood of Christ.¹⁶

The cleansing of the sanctuary, “both in the typical and in the real service,” must be performed with blood because “without shedding of blood is no *remission*. Remission, or putting away of sin, is the work to be accomplished.”¹⁷

She gains a deeper insight into the nature of the cleansing process of the heavenly sanctuary from a study of the typical symbolic service. Such an approach, she feels, is biblical because “the priests who officiated on earth, served ‘unto the example and shadow of heavenly things.’ [Hebrews 8:5](#).¹⁸ The following discussion, therefore, deals with the question of the association of sin with the sanctuary and its subsequent cleansing.

Transfer of Sin to the Sanctuary

Earthly sanctuary. The transfer of sin to the earthly sanctuary occurred during the daily activities of the first apartment ministry, a process consisting of several steps. The first was the transfer of sin from the repentant sinner to the animal. Ellen White sees this illustrated by the act of confession when the penitent sinner in faith placed “his hand upon the victim’s head, confessed his sin, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the innocent sacrifice.”¹⁹

The second step was the transfer from the animal to the sanctuary. After the act of confession the animal was killed as the sinner’s substitute, for God’s broken law demanded the life of the transgressor ([Lev 17:11](#)). This phase of sin transfer could be done in two ways: (1) The blood was carried by the priest into the holy place and sprinkled before the veil. She says that “sin was, through the blood, transferred in figure to the sanctuary.” (2) The animal’s flesh was eaten by the priest so that he received and bore “the iniquity of the congregation” ([Lev 10:17](#)).²⁰ She concludes that “both ceremonies alike symbolized the transfer of the sin from the penitent to the sanctuary,”²¹ with the result that “the holy places were defiled.”²²

However, she points out that the sinner was “not yet entirely released from the condemnation of the law.”²³ The “sin-offerings presented during the year ... had not made full atonement for sin. It had only provided a means by which the sin was transferred to the sanctuary.” “In the type the blood of the sin offering removed the sin from the penitent, but it rested in the sanctuary until the Day of Atonement.”²⁴ Hence there remained “a special work of atonement ... for the cleansing of the sanctuary” on the Day of Atonement.²⁵

Heavenly sanctuary. The transfer of sin from the repentant sinner under the New Covenant was seen to run parallel with the sin transfer process in the earthly sanctuary. Thus she states:

As anciently the sins of the people were by faith placed upon the sin offering and through its blood transferred, in figure, to the earthly sanctuary, so in the new covenant the sins of the repentant are by faith placed upon Christ and transferred, in fact, to the heavenly sanctuary.²⁶

Christ’s blood, “pleaded in behalf of penitent believers secured their pardon and acceptance with the Father” and brought release to them from the condemnation of the law. “Pardon [is] entered against their names in the books of heaven.” Their sins, however, she says, “still remained upon the books of record” in “the sanctuary until the final atonement” in the antitypical day of atonement. Then “the sanctuary will be freed, or cleansed from the record of sin.”²⁷

Final Purification of Sin

Earthly sanctuary. On the Day of Atonement a special work took place to remove the sins that had been transferred to the sanctuary and had defiled its holy places during the daily ministration.²⁸ In this context she refers to the Day of Atonement ritual in [Leviticus 16](#).

And he [the high priest] shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgression in all their sins; and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness ([Lev 16:16](#)).

It is obvious that this “special atonement” to cleanse the sanctuary from the sins of God’s people can be understood only if there had been a previous defilement due to the transfer of sin.

The sanctuary was cleansed by the high priest who, through the blood of the sin offering for the people, made “an atonement … for each of the … apartments” and “for the altar, to ‘cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel’” ([Lev 16:19](#)).²⁹ The sprinkling of this blood in the Most Holy Place upon the mercy seat directly above the law, she says, satisfied the “claims of the law, which demanded the life of the sinner.”³⁰ This was followed by the removal of sins from the sanctuary. She explains:

Then in his character of mediator the priest took the sins upon himself, and leaving the sanctuary, he bore with him the burden of Israel’s guilt. At the door of the tabernacle he laid his hands upon the head of the scape-goat, and confessed over him “all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat” ([Lev 16:21](#)).³¹

This act of confession on the part of the high priest she sees as the symbolic transference of sins from the sanctuary to the scapegoat.³² She adds that “as the goat bearing these sins was sent away, they were, with him, regarded as forever separated from the people.”³³

Heavenly sanctuary. Ellen White refers to [Hebrews 8:5](#) for biblical support to justify the use of the typological principle for interpreting the great antitypical day of atonement. Immediately following her discussion on the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary she comments, “Such was the service performed ‘unto the example and shadow of heavenly things’” ([Heb 8:5](#)).³⁴ She adds, “*What was done in type in the ministration of the earthly sanctuary is done in reality in the ministration of the heavenly sanctuary.*”³⁵ In this framework she refers to the cleansing of the sanctuary as follows:

As in the typical service there was a work of atonement at the close of the year, so before Christ’s work for the redemption of men is completed there is a work of atonement for the removal of sin from the sanctuary. This is the service which began when the 2300 days ended. At that time [1844], as foretold by Daniel the prophet, our High Priest entered the most holy, to perform the last division of His solemn work—to cleanse the sanctuary.³⁶

In a vision this atoning ministry is shown to consist of a “final intercession for all those for whom mercy still lingers and for those who have ignorantly broken the law of God. This atonement is made for the righteous dead as well as for the righteous living.”³⁷

The change of Christ’s heavenly ministry in 1844 she sees confirmed by a vision that “Jesus has risen up and shut the door of the holy place of the heavenly sanctuary and has opened a door into the most holy place and has entered in to cleanse the sanctuary.”³⁸ This transition is especially relevant in the context of [Revelation 3:7–8](#).³⁹

The “actual cleansing” of the heavenly sanctuary, she remarks, is to be accomplished by the “removal, or blotting out, of the sins which are there recorded.”⁴⁰ She argues that “by virtue of the atoning blood of Christ, the sins of all the truly penitent will be blotted from the books of heaven. Thus the sanctuary will be freed, or cleansed, from the record of sin.”⁴¹ The sins of the repentant sinner will be transferred from the heavenly sanctuary to the antitypical scapegoat, “Satan, the author of sin.”⁴² She states:

When the high priest, by virtue of the blood of the sin offering, removed the sins from the sanctuary, he placed them upon the scapegoat. When Christ, by virtue of His own blood, removes the sin of His people from the heavenly sanctuary at the close of His ministration [close of probation], He will place them upon Satan, who, in the execution of the judgment, must bear the final penalty.⁴³

The closing of “Christ’s work for the redemption of men and the purification of the universe from sin” she sees fulfilled by the antitypical day of atonement events of (1) “the removal of sin from the heavenly sanctuary,” and (2) the placing of these sins upon Satan, who will bear the final penalty. It is in this context that she mentions that the typical Day of Atonement directed the minds of the people forward to “the closing events of the great controversy between Christ and Satan, the final purification of the universe from sin and sinners.”⁴⁴

Cleansing of God's People and Daniel 8:14

Ellen White brings out the far-reaching implications of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary for God's people. She calls attention to the necessity of working in harmony with the high priestly ministry of Christ, stating that "we are in the day of atonement, and we are to work in harmony with Christ's work of cleansing the sanctuary from the sins of the people." She urges the believers, therefore, to "sympathize with Jesus in His work in the heavenly courts," and to "cleanse the soul temple of every defilement."⁴⁵

The necessity for such a cleansing among God's people she discusses in view of the approaching termination of Christ's role as high priestly mediator. Commenting on the short period between the close of probation and the Second Advent she quotes [Malachi 3:2-3](#) and relates its cleansing concept to the time of Christ's final ministration.

Those who are living upon the earth when the intercession of Christ shall cease in the sanctuary above are to stand in the sight of a holy God without a mediator. Their robes must be spotless, their characters must be purified from sin by the blood of sprinkling. Through the grace of God and their own diligent effort they must be conquerors in the battle with evil. While the investigative judgment is going forward in heaven, while the sins of penitent believers are being removed from the sanctuary, there is to be a special work of purification, of putting away of sin, among God's people upon earth.⁴⁶

Investigative Judgment

The subject of the sanctuary and the investigative judgment should be clearly understood by the people of God. All need a knowledge for themselves of the position and work of their High Priest. Otherwise it will be impossible for them to exercise the faith which is essential at this time or to occupy the position which God designs them to fill.⁴⁷

Biblical Evidence

[Daniel 8:14](#). This text is always interpreted by Ellen White to indicate the beginning of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary on the antitypical day of atonement. The cleansing process involves a removal or blotting out of sins. However, before this removal of sins can be accomplished, she declares, "there must be an examination of the books of record to determine who, through repentance of sin and faith in Christ, are entitled to the benefits of His atonement."⁴⁸ This leads her to conclude that the cleansing of the sanctuary (since 1844) involves "a work of investigation—a work of judgment."⁴⁹ Due to the fact that the blotting out of sins is to be accomplished at the time probation closes, it follows that this judgment has to be concluded before the Parousia.⁵⁰

[Revelation 22:12](#). Christ's statement, "behold I come quickly: and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be," she associates with an investigative judgment. In fact [Revelation 22:12](#) is seen as evidence that the cleansing of the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#) has to be performed before Christ's return, "for when He comes, His reward is with Him to give to every man according to his works."⁵¹

[Daniel 7:9-10, 13-14](#). Ellen White considers the judgment scene of [Daniel 7](#) as a part of the investigative judgment. These passages, she states, reveal the coming of Christ to the Ancient of days to receive "dominion and glory and a kingdom, which will be given Him at the close of His work as a mediator."⁵² In the context of this coming of Christ, which was associated with the termination of the 2300 days in 1844, she states:

Attended by heavenly angels, our great High Priest enters the holy of holies and there appears in the presence of God to engage in the last acts of His ministration in behalf of man—to perform the work of investigative judgment and to make an atonement for all who are shown to be entitled to its benefits.⁵³

[Revelation 14:6-7](#). This passage reveals much about the nature of the first angel's message. Ellen White comments on its relevance for our time:

It is declared to be a part of the "everlasting gospel;" and it announces the opening of the judgment. The message of salvation has been preached in all ages; but this message is a part of the gospel which could be proclaimed only in the last days, for only then would it be true that the hour of judgment *had come*.⁵⁴

She therefore places the thrust of this message in the "time of the end" with its special proclamation, "Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come." This proclamation, she declares, "pointed to Christ's ministration in the most holy place, to the investigative judgment, and *not* to the coming of Christ for the redemption of His people and the destruction of the wicked."⁵⁵ Thus she could associate [Revelation 14:7](#) with [Daniel 8:14](#), focusing on a similar event—the investigative judgment.⁵⁶

[Luke 20:35](#). The expression "accounted worthy" is seen to be relevant to the investigative judgment. The argument presented is as follows: (1) Those who are "accounted worthy" will be partakers of the resurrection. (2) The righteous will be resurrected at the "resurrection of life" ([John 5:29](#)). (3) "The righteous dead will not be raised until after the judgment at which they are accounted worthy of the resurrection of life."⁵⁷ This preadvent judgment is the investigative judgment.

[Matthew 22:1-14](#). The parable of the marriage feast provided additional evidence for the investigative judgment which she "clearly" sees represented as taking place before the marriage. "By the king's examination of the guests," she says, "is represented a work of judgment."⁵⁸ On the nature of the investigation she writes that the king surveyed the guests "to see if all are attired in the wedding garment, the spotless robe of character washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb. [Matthew 22:11](#); [Revelation 7:14](#). He who is found wanting is cast out, but all who upon examination are seen to have the wedding garment on are accepted of God and accounted worthy of a share in His kingdom and a seal upon His throne."⁵⁹

In concluding she remarks, "This work of examination of character, of determining who are prepared for the kingdom of God, is that of the investigative judgment, the closing work in the sanctuary above."⁶⁰

Nature of the Judgment

Two aspects of final judgment. The final judgment on the world is seen to have two aspects: one for the professed people of God, the other for the wicked. She appeals to [1 Peter 4:17](#) and the Day of Atonement ritual:

In the typical service only those who had come before God with confession and repentance, and whose sins, through the blood of the sin offering, were transferred to the sanctuary, had a part in the service of the Day of Atonement. So in the great day of final atonement and investigative judgment the only cases considered are those of the professed people of God. The judgment of the wicked is a distinct and separate work, and takes place at a later period [during Millennium]. Judgment must begin at the house of God: and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel?⁶¹ [1 Peter 4:17](#).

Persons to be judged. The investigative judgment deals with God's people in the broadest sense of the word and involves everyone who is a candidate for the first resurrection:

... all who have ever entered the service of God.⁶²
... all who have believed on Jesus.⁶³
... all who have ever taken upon themselves the name of Christ.⁶⁴
... those who in all ages have professed to be followers of Christ.⁶⁵
... the professed people of God.⁶⁶

Realizing as she does that "there have ever been two classes among those who profess to be followers of Christ"—the wheat and the tares⁶⁷—we may infer that her concept of the investigative judgment includes those deceived and even apostate followers of Christ who have backslidden. The criteria for participating in this judgment was to have one's name written in the "book of life" which is possible for all "who had come before God with confession and repentance."⁶⁸ This would undoubtedly also include the God-fearing "stranger" or "heathen" who lives up to all the light he/she received.⁶⁹

Judgment records. According to Ellen White the investigative judgment involves three heavenly records. The first and foremost is the "book of life" in which all candidates for the first resurrection are recorded. She finds biblical support in [Luke 10:20](#); [Philippians 4:3](#); [Daniel 12:1](#); [Revelation 20:12](#); [21:27](#); and [Exodus 32:33](#).⁷⁰ Then there is the "book of remembrance" which contains every good deed of the righteous ([Mal 3:16](#); [Neh 13:14](#); [Ps 56:8](#)).⁷¹ Finally there exists the record of sins ([Eccl 12:14](#); [Matt 12:36-37](#); [1 Cor 4:5](#); [Isa 65:6-7](#)).⁷²

Standard of judgment. The standard of judgment by which people are to be tested is "the Bible"⁷³ and specifically the "law of God."⁷⁴

Dynamics of the proceedings. Ellen White testifies that there is an immense interest in the heavenly court proceedings.⁷⁵ Attending those proceedings are the angels who function "as ministers and witnesses, in number 'ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands.'"⁷⁶ The Ancient of days presides in the judgment, while man's defense rests with Jesus Christ.⁷⁷ Yet the spiritual battle of the great controversy rages on. "While Jesus is pleading for the subjects of His grace," she says, "Satan accuses them before God as transgressors." She adds:

Now he points to the record of their lives, to the defects of character, the unlikeness of Christ, which has dishonored their Redeemer, to all the sins that he has tempted them to commit, and because of these he claims them as his subjects.⁷⁸

Court decisions. Two major actions regarding the professed people of God will be taken in the investigative judgment. These are based on whether one possesses "the spotless robe of character washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb."⁷⁹ One action is the blotting out of names. Ellen White, referring to [Exodus 32:33](#) and [Ezekiel 18:24](#) explains that "When any have sins remaining upon the books of record, unrepented of and unforgiven, their names will be blotted out of the book of life, and the record of their good deeds will be erased from the book of God's remembrance."⁸⁰ This decision will only take place when God's people "depart from him, and by stubborn persistence in sin become finally hardened against the influence of his Holy Spirit."⁸¹ The second action is the blotting out of sins. She comments:

All who have truly repented of sin, and by faith claimed the blood of Christ as their atoning sacrifice, have had pardon entered against their names in the books of heaven; as they have become partakers of the righteousness of Christ, and their characters are found to be in harmony with the law of God, their sins will be blotted out, and they themselves will be accounted worthy of eternal life. [[Isa 43:25](#); [Rev 3:5](#); [Matt 10:32](#), 33 quoted].⁸²

Jesus does not excuse the sins of His people, Ellen White says, but "shows their penitence and faith, and, claiming for them forgiveness, He lifts His wounded hands before the Father and the holy angels, saying: I know them by name. I have graven them on the palms of My hands. [[Ps 51:17](#) quoted]."⁸³ She concludes, "Thus will be realized the complete fulfillment of the new-covenant promise" of [Jeremiah 31:34](#); [50:20](#); [Isaiah 4:2-3](#).⁸⁴

Prophetic Illustration of Matthew 25:1–13

The parable of the ten virgins Ellen White interprets as a dual illustration of the experience of God's people before the Second Advent. One of its applications is an illustration of the Second Advent movement experience and its subsequent continuation in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. She thereby confirms a long-standing view that understands this parable to be a picture of God's guidance in the 1844 Advent experience.⁸⁵ Because of the impact of the parable on the Advent movement and its contemporary relevance to 1844 and the sanctuary doctrine, we will survey her interpretation. In comparing the way she uses the parable one cannot but be impressed with the close parallel of the historical data of the Advent experience with the biblical text.

Contextual Setting of the Parable

In her approach she clearly places the parable in the context of Christ's Olivet discourse:

The parable of the ten virgins of Matthew 25 also illustrates the experience of the Adventist people. In Matthew 24, in answer to the question of His disciples concerning the sign of His coming and of the end of the world, Christ had pointed out some of the most important events in the history of the world and of the church from His first to His second advent; namely, the destruction of Jerusalem, the great tribulation of the church under the pagan and papal persecutions, the darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of the stars. After this He spoke of His coming in His kingdom, and related the parable describing the two classes of servants who look for His appearing. Chapter 25 opens with the words: "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins." Here is brought to view the church living in the last days, the same that is pointed out in the close of chapter 24. In this parable their experience is illustrated by the incidents of an Eastern marriage.⁸⁶

The Advent Experience Until the First Disappointment

In Matthew 25:1–6 she sees an illustration of the experience of the Adventist people until the Great Disappointment. Immediately after citing this passage she discusses the Advent experience in the light of verses 1–4. The Millerites in general related this parable to the Second Advent, as she notes.

"Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to meet the bridegroom. And five of them were wise, and five were foolish. They that were foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them: but the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept. And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him."

The coming of Christ, as announced by the first angel's message, was understood to be represented by the coming of the bridegroom. The widespread reformation under the proclamation of His soon coming, answered to the going forth of the virgins. In this parable, as in that of Matthew 24, two classes are represented. All had taken their lamps, the Bible, and by its light had gone forth to meet the Bridegroom. But while "they that were foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them," "the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps." The latter class had received the grace of God, the regenerating, enlightening power of the Holy Spirit, which renders His word a lamp to the feet and a light to the path. In the fear of God they had studied the Scriptures to learn the truth, and had earnestly sought for purity of heart and life. These had a personal experience, a faith in God and in His word, which could not be overthrown by disappointment and delay. Others "took their lamps, and took no oil with them." They had moved from impulse. Their fears had been excited by the solemn message, but they had depended upon the faith of their brethren, satisfied with the flickering light of good emotions, without a thorough understanding of the truth or a genuine work of grace in the heart. These had gone forth to meet the Lord, full of hope in the prospect of immediate reward; but they were not prepared for delay and disappointment. When trials came, their faith failed, and their lights burned dim.⁸⁷

Aftermath of the First Disappointment

The condition among Adventists after their first major disappointment in the spring of 1844 she sees reflected in Matthew 25:5—

"While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept." By the tarrying of the bridegroom is represented the passing of the time when the Lord was expected, the disappointment, and the seeming delay. In this time of uncertainty, the interest of the superficial and halfhearted soon began to waver, and their efforts to relax; but those whose faith was based on a personal knowledge of the Bible had a rock beneath their feet, which the waves of disappointment could not wash away. "They all slumbered and slept," one class in unconcern and abandonment of their faith, the other class patiently waiting till clearer light should be given. Yet in the night of trial the latter seemed to lose, to some extent, their zeal and devotion. The halfhearted and superficial could no longer lean upon the faith of their brethren. Each must stand or fall for himself.⁸⁸

The "Midnight Cry"⁸⁹

After the first disappointment, as a result of a thorough reevaluation of their prophetic data, the Adventists developed new insights which led to the conviction that October 22, 1844, was truly the termination of the 2300 years. This new light became relevant at the chronological midpoint between the time of the first disappointment and the now-expected time of the Second Advent and resulted in the mushrooming revival of the seventh-month movement. On this event, which Ellen White sees illustrated by Matthew 25:6 she comments:

"While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept. And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him. Then all those virgins arose, and trimmed their lamps." Matthew 25:5–7. In the summer of 1844, midway between the time when it had been first thought that the 2300 days would end, and the autumn of the same year, to which it was afterward found that they extended, the message was proclaimed in the very words of Scripture: "Behold, the Bridegroom cometh!"⁹⁰

This proclamation she saw later in a vision as a "great light from heaven shining upon the people of God,"⁹¹ and involving the work of angels.⁹² During this revival there were a few aspects of the parable such as the coming of the Bridegroom and the shut door which were not fully understood.

The Seventh-day Adventist Experience

Following the disappointment in the fall of 1844, however, new insights emerged. They placed these unfulfilled aspects in a new perspective, bringing the parable up-to-date as an illustration of the continuation of the Advent movement in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. These insights came as a result of a study of the Bridegroom theme in Revelation and the Gospels.

In her description of the salvation-historical significance of the parable for the Seventh-day Adventist Church Ellen White says:

In the summer and autumn of 1844 the proclamation, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh," was given. The two classes represented by the wise and foolish virgins were then developed—one class who looked with joy to the Lord's appearing, and who had been diligently preparing to meet Him; another class that, influenced by fear and acting from impulse, had been satisfied with a theory of the truth, but were destitute of the grace of God. In the parable, when the bridegroom came, "they that were ready went in with him to the marriage." The coming of the bridegroom, here brought to view, takes place before the marriage. The marriage represents the reception by Christ of His kingdom. The Holy City, the New Jerusalem, which is the capital and representative of the kingdom, is called 'the bride, the Lamb's wife.' Said the angel to John: "Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife." "He carried me away in the spirit," says the prophet, 'and showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God.' Revelation 21:9, 10. Clearly, then, the bride represents the Holy City, and the virgins that go out to meet the bridegroom are a symbol of the church. In the Revelation the people of God are said to be the guests at the marriage supper. Revelation 19:9. If guests, they cannot be represented also as the bride. Christ, as stated by the prophet Daniel, will receive from the Ancient of Days in heaven, "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom;" He will receive the New Jerusalem, the capital of His kingdom, "prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." Daniel 7:14; Revelation 21:2. Having received the kingdom, He will come in His glory, as King of kings and Lord of lords, for the redemption of His people, who are to "sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob," at His table in His kingdom (Matthew 8:11; Luke 22:30), to partake of the marriage supper of the Lamb.

The proclamation, "Behold, the Bridegroom cometh," in the summer of 1844, led thousands to expect the immediate advent of the Lord. At the appointed time the Bridegroom came, not to the earth, as the people expected, but to the Ancient of Days in heaven, to the marriage, the reception of His kingdom. "They that were ready went in with Him to the marriage: and the door was shut." They were not to be present in person at the marriage; for it takes place in heaven, while they are upon the earth. The followers of Christ are to "wait for their Lord, when He will return from the wedding." Luke 12:36. But they are to understand His work, and to follow Him by faith as He goes in before God. It is in this sense that they are said to go in to the marriage.

In the parable it was those that had oil in their vessels with their lamps that went in to the marriage. Those who, with a knowledge of the truth from the Scriptures, had also the Spirit and grace of God, and who, in the night of their bitter trial, had patiently waited, searching the Bible for clearer light—these saw the truth concerning the sanctuary in heaven and the Saviour's change in ministration, and by faith they followed Him in His work in the sanctuary above. And all who through the testimony of the Scriptures accept the same truths, following Christ by faith as He enters in before God to perform the last work of mediation, and at its close to receive His kingdom—all these are represented as going in to the marriage.

In the parable of Matthew 22 the same figure of the marriage is introduced, and the investigative judgment is clearly represented as taking place before the marriage. Previous to the wedding the king comes in to see the guests, to see if all are attired in the wedding garment, the spotless robe of character washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb. Matthew 22:11; Revelation 7:14. He who is found wanting is cast out, but all who upon examination are seen to have the wedding garment on are accepted of God and accounted worthy of a share in His kingdom and a seat upon His throne. This work of examination of character, of determining who are prepared for the kingdom of God, is that of the investigative judgment, the closing work in the sanctuary above.

When the work of investigation shall be ended, when the cases of those who in all ages have professed to be followers of Christ have been examined and decided, then, and not till then, probation will close, and the door of mercy will be shut. Thus in the one short sentence, "They that were ready went in with Him to the marriage: and the door was shut," we are carried down through the Saviour's final ministration, to the time when the great work for man's salvation shall be completed.⁹³

The Parable's Twofold Meaning

The twofold application of the parable of the ten virgins by Ellen White reveals her ability to perceive a basic unity underlying the various NT aspects of the eschatological marriage theme regarding Christ as the Bridegroom, the New Jerusalem as well as the church as the bride, and the invitation to the marriage supper for God's people. In order to understand her approach it is important to consider the setting of the parable as she describes it:

Christ with His disciples is seated upon the Mount of Olives. The sun has set behind the mountains, and the heavens are curtained with the shades of evening. In full view is a dwelling house lighted up brilliantly as if for some festive scene. The light streams from the openings, and an expectant company wait around, indicating that a marriage procession is soon to appear. In many parts of the East, wedding festivities are held in the evening. The bridegroom goes forth to meet his bride and bring her to his home. By torchlight the bridal party proceed from her father's house to his own, where a feast is provided for the invited guests. In the scene upon which Christ looks, a company are awaiting the appearance of the bridal party, intending to join the procession.⁹⁴

From the description one discovers that this marriage procedure consists of two phases: (1) the going of the bridegroom to the father to receive the bride, (2) the going of the bridegroom to the marriage feast for the celebration with the invited guests.

The first phase Ellen White sees as illustrative of the Advent experience. This interpretation discusses the parable in the context of Christ as the bridegroom, the New Jerusalem as the bride, the believers as the guests, and Christ's coming to the Ancient of days to receive His kingdom. She thus states that in 1844 Christ, as the bridegroom, came to the Ancient of days to receive the kingdom ([Dan 7:13–14](#)) which according to Revelation is represented by the New Jerusalem, "the bride, the Lamb's wife" ([Rev 21:9–10](#)).

The marriage, defined as "the reception by Christ of His kingdom,"⁹⁵ she understands to be a process, covering the period from 1844 until the completion of the investigative judgment when the sins of God's people are blotted out. At that time she remarks:

The subjects of the kingdom were made up. The marriage of the Lamb was consummated. And the kingdom, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, was given to Jesus and the heirs of salvation, and Jesus was to reign as King of kings and Lord of lords.⁹⁶

Thus the first phase of the marriage between Christ and His kingdom is completed. This period is also described in the parable of the marriage feast ([Matt 22](#)) as a period of investigation to determine the subjects for the kingdom. Not until the completion of this process—and the "door was shut"—could the actual wedding celebration begin.

The second phase of the marriage between Christ and His kingdom pertains to the actual marriage celebration that is manifested by the visible uniting of Christ and His church after the Second Advent. In contrast with the previous interpretation, this application focused on Christ's coming to the earth, not to the Ancient of days, and referred to the church as the bride.

In the second application Ellen White concentrates on the believers' readiness "to meet the Bridegroom" when He comes at the Second Advent.⁹⁷ Commenting on the church as the bride she states that after His return, Christ "shall bring home His bride to the Father's house, and the redeemed with the Redeemer shall sit down to the marriage supper of the Lamb,"⁹⁸ At this point she refers to John's record of his vision, stating:

"I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to Him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself ready." "Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb." [Rev. 19:6, 7, 9.](#)⁹⁹

The marriage spoken of here she seems to apply to the actual marriage celebration that is highlighted by the marriage supper of the Lamb to which God's people are invited. She sees the proclamation of the call to the marriage supper as a vital part of the mission of God's church.¹⁰⁰ However, we should never lose sight of the fact that the application of the parable to the Advent experience provides Adventists today with the privilege of "going in to the marriage" in the sense that by faith "they are to understand" the nature of Christ's work in the reception of His kingdom.¹⁰¹

Blotting Out of Sins

Ellen White's understanding of the blotting out of sins seems to be twofold. In the majority of her references to this expression, and especially in the context of the cleansing of the sanctuary of [Daniel 8:14](#), she employs it to describe the removal of the sins of the truly penitent sinner from the heavenly records during the investigative judgment. Textual support is seen in [Exodus 32:33](#); [Isaiah 43:25](#); [Revelation 3:5](#); [Matthew 10:32–33](#).¹⁰²

In some cases, however, depending on the context, it seems to connote forgiveness of sins. In discussing the parable of the prodigal son she says:

In the parable there is no taunting, no casting up to the prodigal of his evil course. The son feels that the past is forgiven and forgotten, blotted out forever. And so God says to the sinner, "I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins." [Isa. 44:22](#). [[Jer 31:34](#); [50:20](#); [Isa 55:7](#) quoted].¹⁰³

The Church As Sanctuary

In her writings Ellen White employs the term "sanctuary" in several ways. In some instances the church on earth is referred to as the sanctuary. In commenting on [Ezekiel 9:5–6](#), she says, "Here we see that the church—the Lord's sanctuary—was the first to feel the stroke of the wrath of God."¹⁰⁴ In the context of [Zechariah 6:12–13](#) and [Ephesians 2:20–22](#) she refers to Christ's work for man: "He shall build the temple of the Lord." By His sacrifice and mediation Christ is both the foundation and builder of the church of God.¹⁰⁵ In another instance she compares the earthly sanctuary with the church. Quoting [Ephesians 2:4–22](#) and alluding to [Hebrews 8:2](#) she writes:

The Jewish tabernacle was a type of the Christian church.... The church on earth, composed of those who are faithful and loyal to God, is the "true tabernacle," whereof the Redeemer is the minister. God, and not man, pitched this tabernacle on a high, elevated platform.

This tabernacle is Christ's body, and from north, south, east, and west He gathers those who shall help to compose it.... A holy tabernacle is built upon those who receive Christ as their personal Saviour.... Christ is the minister of the true tabernacle, the high priest of all who believe in Him as a personal Saviour.¹⁰⁶

Finally, she illustrates the unity between God's people and the heavenly intelligences with the image of the church. The former representing the outer court, the latter the inner court:

The church of God upon the earth are one with the church of God above. Believers on the earth, and those who have never fallen in heaven, are one church.... In the inner court of heaven they listen to the testimonies of the witnesses for Christ in the outer court on earth.¹⁰⁷

These statements show that she recognizes that the term "sanctuary" could have various meanings according to its context. It is clear, however, that in none of the above usages is there any allusions to [Daniel 8:14](#). All her references to this text are unambiguous and pertain to the heavenly sanctuary, not to God's people.

Day of Atonement Allusions

As has been shown above, Ellen White held the position that the antitypical day of atonement began in 1844 in fulfillment of the prophecy of [Daniel 8:14](#). However, she sometimes employs the various features of that special day to illustrate the significance of Christ's mission to humanity.

In one instance she uses some aspects of the high priestly ministry to illustrate Christ's incarnation, sacrifice, and subsequent ministry till the Second Advent:

As in the typical service the high priest laid aside his pontifical robes and officiated in the white linen dress of an ordinary priest; so Christ laid aside His royal robes and garbed Himself with humanity and offered sacrifice, Himself the priest, Himself the victim. As the high priest, after performing his service in the holy of holies, came forth to the waiting congregation in his pontifical robes; so Christ will come the second time, clothed in garments of whitest white, "so as no fuller on earth can white them." [Mark 9:3](#). He will come in His own glory, and in the glory of His Father, and all the angelic host will escort Him on His way.¹⁰⁸

Another allusion to the Day of Atonement focuses on the change of the high priestly attire to show Christ's humiliation from His incarnation till the cross:

In stooping to take upon Himself humanity, Christ revealed a character opposite of the character of Satan. But He stepped still lower in the path of humility. 'Being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' [Phil. 2:8](#). As the high priest laid aside his gorgeous pontifical robes, and officiated in the white linen dress of the common priest, so Christ took the form of a servant, and offered sacrifice, Himself the priest, Himself the victim.¹⁰⁹

Context of Daniel 8:14

Whether one considers her interpretation of [Daniel 8:14](#) to honor the biblical context depends on one's understanding of the nature of the investigative judgment and that of the little horn. In the above discussion on the persons to be judged during the investigative judgment it was pointed out that Ellen White's categories include the professed people of God in the broadest sense of the word. Any who have accepted God and sincerely confessed their sins were entered into the book of life.

As to the significance of the little horn it should be noticed that those accepting the end of the 2300 years in 1844 also view the little horn as representing papal Rome. This means that the little horn refers not to a pagan but to an apostate Christian power whose exploits reveal the conflict between true and apostate Christianity. The implication is that anyone who belongs to this power would be subject to the investigative judgment.

In harmony with the context, "the cleansing of the sanctuary" in [Daniel 8:14](#) is the legitimate response to the question regarding the termination of the exploits of the little horn. The divine intervention with regard to the actions of apostate Christianity commences the judgment—the first phase of it consisting of a judgment on the professed people of God, including those belonging to the little horn.

The result of this judgment will be (1) a vindication of the saints for whom Christ will administer His final atonement and blot out their sins from the heavenly record, (2) a blotting out of names from the book of life of those professed followers who, by cherishing iniquity, backslid and apostatized, making them subject to the second death. In this larger concept of the judgment Ellen White's interpretation of [Daniel 8:14](#) adequately honors the context. Similar argumentation could be applied to the judgment scene of [Daniel 7](#) and its little horn.

Christ's High Priestly Ministry and the Cross

The rending of the veil ([Matt 27:51](#)) at the time of Christ's death Ellen White considers an important incident. It symbolizes the termination of the earthly sanctuary service and the opening of a new way of unrestricted access to God through Christ's high priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary. Commenting on the events following Christ's death, she states:

With a rending noise the inner veil of the temple is torn from top to bottom by an unseen hand, throwing open to the gaze of the multitude a place once filled with the presence of God. In this place the Shekinah had dwelt. Here God had manifested His glory above the mercy seat. No one but the high priest ever lifted the veil separating this apartment from the rest of the temple. He entered in once a year to make an atonement for the sins of the people. But lo, this veil is rent in twain. The most holy place of the earthly sanctuary is no longer sacred.

All is terror and confusion. The priest is about to slay the victim; but the knife drops from his nerveless hand, and the lamb escapes. Type has met antitype in the death of God's Son. The great sacrifice has been made. The way into the holiest is laid open. A new and living way is prepared for all. No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest. Henceforth the Saviour was to officiate as priest and advocate in the heaven of heavens. It was as if a living voice had spoken to the worshipers: There is now an end to all sacrifices and offerings for sin. The Son of God is come according to His word, "Lo, I come (in the volume of the Book it is written of Me,) to do Thy will, O God." "By His own blood" He entereth "in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." [Heb. 10:7; 9:12](#).¹¹⁰

The context makes it clear that [Matthew 27:51](#) revealed that the earthly sacrificial system had come to an end and a new and living way was prepared for all. Now sinful, sorrowing humanity did not need to await the coming of the high priest. All restrictions and limitations of the Mosaic system have been eliminated, because "Henceforth the Saviour was to officiate as priest and advocate in the heaven of heavens."

This new and living way was the "way into the holiest" because the Son of God "by His own blood" entered "in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us" ([Heb 9:12](#)). This last text simply refers to the fact that Christ by virtue of His sacrifice could enter into the heavenly sanctuary to inaugurate and make effective this new way to approach God.

In another instance she also uses this text to illustrate the beginning of Christ's sanctuary ministry.¹¹¹ In this case she refers to the "blood of goats and calves" ([Heb 9:12](#)). These animals were used together during the inauguration service of the earthly tabernacle ([Lev 9:8, 15, 22](#)).

Other instances in which she employs the rending of the veil to illustrate the abolition of the typical service and the inauguration of the antitypical one were:

The mercy seat, upon which the glory of God rested in the holiest of all, is opened to all who accept Christ as the propitiation for sin, and through its medium, they are brought into fellowship with God. The veil is rent, the partition walls broken down, the handwriting of ordinances canceled. By virtue of His blood the enmity is abolished. Through faith in Christ Jew and Gentile may partake of the living bread.¹¹²

By the rending of the veil of the temple, God said, I can no longer reveal My presence in the most holy place. A new and living Way, before which there hangs no veil, is offered to all. No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest. Type had met antitype in the death of God's Son. The Lamb of God had been offered as a sacrifice. It was as if a voice had said to the worshipers, "There is now an end to all sacrifices and offerings."¹¹³

As Jesus died on Calvary, He cried, "It is finished," and the veil of the temple was rent in twain, from the top to the bottom. This was to show that the services of the earthly sanctuary were forever finished, and that God would no more meet with the priests in their earthly temple, to accept their sacrifices. The blood of Jesus was then shed, which was to be offered by Himself in the heavenly sanctuary. As the priest entered the most holy once a year to cleanse the earthly sanctuary, so Jesus entered the most holy of the heavenly, at the end of the 2300 days of [Daniel 8](#), in 1844, to make a final atonement for all who could be benefited by His mediation, and thus to cleanse the sanctuary.¹¹⁴

The thrust of these passages is that the typical sanctuary service was abolished and a new means of approaching God has been made manifest through Christ's antitypical high priestly ministry, not that the antitypical day of atonement had begun at the cross.

Christ's act of consecration or dedication of the heavenly sanctuary, including the most holy place, before He would begin His continual intercessory ministry she describes as follows:

Still bearing humanity, He ascended to heaven, triumphant and victorious. He has taken the blood of the atonement into the holiest of all, sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat and His own garments, and blessed the people. Soon He will appear the second time to declare that there is no more sacrifice for sin.¹¹⁵

After the dedication of the sanctuary Christ blessed the people by the outpouring of His Spirit at Pentecost.

The Heavenly Sanctuary and Hebrews

Two-partite Sanctuary

In reasoning from the types, Ellen White argues that (1) the "holy places" of the earthly tabernacle were "patterns of things in the heavens" ([Heb 9:23](#));¹¹⁶ (2) "Paul declares that 'the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry,' when completed, were 'the patterns of things in the heavens'" ([Heb 9:21, 23](#));¹¹⁷ (3) "the holy places made with hands are 'figures of the true,' 'patterns of things in the heavens' ([Hebrews 9:24, 23](#))—a miniature representation of the heavenly temple where Christ, our great high priest, after offering his life as a sacrifice, was to minister in the sinner's behalf."¹¹⁸

"Within the Veil"

In the Ellen White writings the meaning of the expression "within the veil" depends on the context. Thus it can mean the veil of the first apartment,¹¹⁹ the veil of the second apartment,¹²⁰ or a non-specific reference simply indicating being in the very presence of God.¹²¹ Her use of "within the veil" in the context of [Hebrews 6:19](#) follows a similar pattern. It is mentioned in the setting of Christ's first apartment ministry,¹²² but the majority of instances are nonspecific.¹²³

Appendix C

Challengers to the Doctrine of the Sanctuary*

Arnold V. Wallenkampf

The NT church believed that after Jesus' ascension He ministered for His followers in the very presence of God in a heavenly sanctuary. In the Epistle to the Hebrews in particular the writer is trying to turn the eyes of the Jewish Christians away from the ministry in the earthly sanctuary/temple to a heavenly sanctuary with a more perfect ministry by their own resurrected and ascended Lord and Saviour. Gradually, however, the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary became obscured. The eyes and attention of Christian believers were largely directed toward the confessional, the sacrifice of the mass, saints, and the virgin Mary in place of the continuous or daily mediation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. Christ's continuous ministry in the heavenly sanctuary on behalf of mankind was soft-pedaled, lost sight of, and largely forgotten.

But prophecy foretold that the eyes of true believers would again be turned back to the heavenly sanctuary. At the end of the 2300 days Christ's all-sufficient ministry in it on behalf of repentant sinners would become the focus of attention of faithful believers and the sanctuary would be cleansed and vindicated (see [Dan 8:11–14](#)). Directing the thoughts of believers to the truth of Christ's ministry in the sanctuary in heaven is a prominent Seventh-day Adventist contribution to theology. Other tenets of our faith have been gathered as jewels of truth from other churches and denominations and in the context of the great controversy placed in the setting of the three angels' messages of [Revelation 14](#). This is true of all our teachings except Christ's present-day ministry in the heavenly sanctuary to ready a people to go with Him to mansions of glory at the Parousia.

The sanctuary teaching, being uniquely our own, has also laid us open as a church to more opprobrium, ridicule, and scorn from other Christian churches than any other doctrine we hold. It has denigrated the atonement in their eyes. It has also caused departures from our faith, even of some who were once leaders in our evangelizing ministry throughout the world.

Internal Challengers

Owen R. L. Crosier (1820–1913) published the first articles on the sanctuary doctrine after having studied and developed it with Hiram Edson (1806–1882) and Dr. F. B. Hahn (fl. 1844–1853). He soon rejected both it and the seventh-day Sabbath. But he did not sever his connection with the embryonic Seventh-day Adventist Church because of disagreement with its sanctuary teaching. He himself had been in the forefront of its discovery and early promulgation. Disenchantment with the Seventh-day Adventist teachings in general led him to leave the church. The same may be said about Dudley Marvin Canright who for years had labored successfully in the Seventh-day Adventist ministry.

Dudley M. Canright

D. M. Canright (1840–1919) was ordained to the Seventh-day Adventist ministry at the age of 25. As a Seventh-day Adventist minister, he became prominent both in church administration, being for some time a member of the General Conference Committee, and as a writer. But in 1887 he resigned his position in the church, severed his connection with it, and became a Baptist minister. After his disaffection, he wrote the widely circulated book *Seventh-day Adventism Renounced*.¹

In his book, Canright asserts that the whole Seventh-day Adventist "argument on the sanctuary depends upon proving that the seventy weeks of [Daniel 9](#) are part of the twenty-three hundred days of [Daniel 8:14](#)."² About the pivotal significance of the sanctuary doctrine to Seventh-day Adventists, he says that "Seventh-day Adventists make everything turn upon their view of the sanctuary. It is vital with them. If they are wrong on this, their whole theory breaks down."³

As alleged evidence of the error of the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary doctrine, he observes that "not even one of the leading Adventists, like Miller, Himes, Fitch, etc., ever accepted this sanctuary explanation. Only a mere handful out of the great mass of 1844 Adventists found out the truth about the sanctuary, and these were men of no note in Miller's work.... Miller himself opposed the Seventh-day Adventists' move, rejecting the idea of the sanctuary."⁴

He cast further aspersions on the origin of the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary doctrine by saying that "instead of receiving the 'light' on the sanctuary question from Mrs. White's vision, or from heaven, they got it from O.R.L. Crosier. But he soon gave it all up as an error, and has opposed the Seventh-day Adventists for many years. It looks bad for a theory when its very authors renounce it."⁵ As to the reason for its origin, he said, "Seventh-day Adventists at first adopted the sanctuary theory to prove that the door of mercy was shut in 1844."⁶ Canright—the ex-Seventh-day Adventist—categorically repudiated the sanctuary doctrine by saying, "The Adventists' idea of the sanctuary in heaven is an absurdity."⁷

During the first third of the twentieth century, three leaders within the Seventh-day Adventist Church defected as a result of disagreement with the sanctuary doctrine. These were Albion Fox Ballenger, W. W. Fletcher, and Louis Richard Conradi.

Albion Fox Ballenger

Albion Fox Ballenger (1861–1921) was born on an Illinois farm just about the time his father became a Seventh-day Adventist minister. Albion first became a school teacher. Then he followed in the footsteps of his father, became a minister, and entered Battle Creek College. He served successfully both in the United States and in Great Britain. In Great Britain he did large-city evangelism and then successively became president of the Welsh and Irish Missions.

The seed of his disenchantment with the church's sanctuary teaching was a sermon he preached on the subject while he was engaged in evangelism. While in administrative work, Ballenger continued to study the church's teaching on the sanctuary. As a consequence, he changed his thinking about Christ's postascension ministry in heaven.

Because of his changed views on the sanctuary, Ballenger was called to appear before the Executive Committee of the British Union Conference early in 1905. There he presented his views during three early morning sessions. Since his views differed from the teachings of the denomination, he was deposed from the superintendency of the Irish Mission. The union committee later decided that Ballenger should present his views to the General Conference that was soon to convene in Washington, DC.⁸

At the General Conference Session in Washington, DC, Ballenger presented his views on the sanctuary to a committee of 25. The result was that he was deprived of his ministerial credentials. Upon this, he retired to a farm.⁹ In compliance with the request of the committee, he promised not to agitate his views but said that he would tell friends and acquaintances about them with meekness and fear if and when they inquired. This would give the committee time to study the matter and refute his views.¹⁰ Four years later, when no answer or refutation of his views had been forthcoming, he published the book *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ*. This small book sets forth his views on the heavenly sanctuary and its services.

In response to this book, E. E. Andross (1868–1950), a California church administrator at the time, wrote *A More Excellent Ministry*.¹¹ To counteract it, Ballenger wrote his second book, *An Examination of Forty Fatal Errors Regarding the Atonement*. In this book he amplified some of the points he had already made in *Cast Out for the Cross of Christ*.

Ballenger believed there was and is a two-apartment sanctuary in heaven and that prior to the cross¹² services were conducted in its first apartment by angels who administered pardon to repentant sinners under an immortal Melchizedek as high priest.¹³ Ballenger further believed that Christ became man's substitute immediately upon Adam and Eve's sin. As such, He was counted as a sinner and was barred from the presence of the Father and could not approach Him within the veil until He was able to present His own shed blood as an atonement for the sins He had vicariously assumed.¹⁴ In view of that separation, Ballenger said that Christ's words in His high priestly prayer in [John 17:5](#), as He was about to pay the redemption price on the cross, assumed their full significance. To make this prayer even more emphatic, he cited it as follows from the *Twentieth Century New Testament*: "And now do thou honor me, Father, *at thine own side*, with the honor which I had beside thee before the world began." Ballenger believed this verse taught that Jesus "occupied a place at His Father's side on the throne, before the world began, which He did not occupy after sin entered,"¹⁵ and that this prayer was a request for the privilege of returning to His Father's side. He applied Jesus' exclamation on the cross, "It is finished," to the termination of His separation from His Father caused by His assumption of man's sins.¹⁶

According to Ballenger, the Day of Atonement began when Jesus made atonement for the sins of man by presenting His own shed blood before the Father within the 70 weeks of [Daniel 9:24–27](#).¹⁷ To substantiate the point that atonement was made within the seventieth week, he pointed out that the phrase "to make reconciliation" in [Daniel 9:24](#) would have been more correctly translated "atone" or "make atonement" as the same Hebrew word is translated in [Leviticus 16](#). Ballenger also supported this translation with a statement from Ellen White where she says, "Jesus refused to receive the homage of His people until He had the assurance that His sacrifice was accepted by the Father. He ascended to the heavenly courts, and from God Himself heard the assurance that the [sic] atonement for the sins of men had been ample, that through His blood all might gain eternal life."¹⁸

Ballenger believed that the services by the angels and Melchizedek in the first apartment of the heavenly sanctuary ended at the cross, and that Jesus upon His ascension began His ministry "within the veil,"¹⁹ or in the Most Holy Place where he believed God's immovable throne is located.²⁰

With reference to defilement of the sanctuary, Ballenger referred to [Leviticus 20:3](#) (KJV) which reads, "And I will set my face against that man, and will cut him off from among his people; because he hath given of his seed unto Molech, to defile my sanctuary, and to profane my holy name." He believed that men's sins are recorded in the heavenly sanctuary as soon as they are committed, whether or not they are confessed, and that the heavenly sanctuary is defiled by a sinner's sinning and not by his confession of his sin. The confession of sin, symbolized in the ancient sanctuary service by the slain sacrificial animal whose blood was smeared on the horns of the altar of burnt offering or of incense and sprinkled on the veil, did not defile the sanctuary by transferring sin to it. Ballenger pointed out that sin is recorded in the heavenly sanctuary, according to [Jeremiah 17:1](#), which reads, "The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron; with a point of diamond it is engraved on the tablet of their heart, and on the horns of their altars" (RSV). The sacrificial blood, Ballenger said, rather than transferring sin to the sanctuary and thus defiling it, constituted an application for forgiveness for the sin committed and recorded on the horns of the altars of the sanctuary²¹ in the same way as the shed blood of Christ atones for the repentant sinner's sin, recorded in heaven.²²

Ballenger further believed that atonement for iniquity, made on the cross, and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary are two distinct events. The heavenly sanctuary was to be cleansed from the record of sins at the end of the 2300 days.²³ He maintained that there is a distinct difference between the atonement for iniquity made in mercy at the mercy seat for repentant sinners and the cleansing of the sanctuary, which is atonement made in judgment. These two events are separated by more than 1800 years.²⁴

Ballenger explained that there are two parties to every sin—Satan and man. The repentant sinner's guilt is atoned for by Christ; Satan's share of both repentant man's sin and the unrepentant sinner's sin are unpardonable and remain on the books of heaven charged against Satan and the unrepentant sinner until the atonement in judgment that began in 1844. After Jesus, as man's high priest, made atonement for iniquity on the cross, He waits for man to accept it. But at the end of the 2300 days, judgment would finally be meted out to the instigator of sin as well as to all those who have not accepted Christ's atonement for them. As these sins, chargeable to Satan and unrepentant sinners, are laid upon them at the end of the investigative judgment, the sanctuary is cleansed, as was the earthly sanctuary at the end of the Day of Atonement.²⁵

As noted, Ballenger did not reject the sanctuary teaching; he retained and radically modified the Seventh-day Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary. A few years after the publication of his last book, Ballenger began to issue a periodical called *The Gathering Call* to disseminate his views among Seventh-day Adventists. He did win over to his side some Seventh-day Adventists, including his father J. F. Ballenger, and his brother E. S. Ballenger, both of whom were Seventh-day Adventist ministers, but he did not try to forge his sympathizers into an organized offshoot movement. Nor did he ever join another church or religious organization on being excluded from the Seventh-day Adventist Church.²⁶

William W. Fletcher

W. W. Fletcher (1879–1947) served as evangelist and administrator in both Australia and Southern Asia prior to his teaching Bible at Australian Missionary College from 1924 through 1926. It was during his years of teaching that Fletcher developed new convictions regarding Christ's position and work in the heavenly sanctuary.

While a member of the union conference staff, he continued to study about the sanctuary. He revealed his findings to some Australian brethren around the beginning of 1929. After this he presented his views in writing to the General Conference president, W. A. Spicer, who referred the matter back to the Australian Union Conference. In December 1929, he unveiled his views to leading brethren in Australia who asked him to explain himself more fully on the subject. This he did in February 1930.²⁷

As an evangelical, Fletcher believed that according to the Scriptures the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary teaching is a mistake²⁸ and that there is no evidence of an investigative judgment, such as Seventh-day Adventists teach and as typified by the services of the Day of Atonement.²⁹ With Ballenger he believed that the Seventh-day Adventist teaching "that Christ did not enter upon His ministry in the Holy of Holies until 1844"³⁰ contravenes the fundamentals of the gospel. Together with Ballenger, Fletcher also taught that smearing the sacrificial animal's shed blood on the horns of the altars and sprinkling it on the veil signified the expiation of sin rather than its transfer to the sanctuary.³¹ That, he maintained, is the implication of [Hebrews 9:22](#) which says that "without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins."³² Because the sinner is purged from his sins by the blood of Christ, he has "boldness to enter into the holy place."³³ Fletcher held that "there is no prophecy that can be shown to be in conflict with the teaching that sin is expiated by the blood of Christ, and that Christ entered the Holy of Holies in heaven at the time of His ascension. It is only our [the Seventh-day Adventist] interpretation of some of the prophecies and types that is in conflict with those truths."³⁴

Fletcher asserted that Ellen White, with the other early pioneers, immediately "after 1844 held views regarding the sanctuary that were even still more erroneous," as, that the door of salvation was shut to sinners³⁵ and that the earth was the sanctuary.³⁶ He thus thought that Seventh-day Adventists ought to shed their early sanctuary teachings even though they made a strong appeal to the believers immediately after the Disappointment.

With reference to "what is meant by the cleansing of the sanctuary referred to in [Daniel 8:13–14](#)," Fletcher believed that a reader must not hold "too rigidly to the word 'cleansed.'" He pointed out that "cleansed" would be equally correctly rendered "justified" and referred to the ministry in the heavenly sanctuary that had been misrepresented or perverted by the papacy. At the end of "2300 evenings-mornings" it would come into its own again, he said, or be justified.³⁷

After the Australian leaders in April 1930 had further discussed Fletcher's views of the sanctuary with him, Fletcher was invited to go to the United States to study the sanctuary question with some Americans. In Washington the General Conference appointed a group of 13 members from the General Conference Committee to grant Fletcher a hearing. The review committee met with Fletcher seven times, each meeting lasting several hours. In addition to these, there were meetings with smaller groups and with workers. At these, Fletcher was afforded opportunity to present his views, as he himself writes, "in a friendly atmosphere."³⁸ The findings of the committee of 13 were "that Brother Fletcher's principal propositions are fundamentally wrong; that therefore the conclusions he has reached and to which he holds tenaciously, believing on these propositions, are also wrong."³⁹ As a result Fletcher severed his connections with the Seventh-day Adventist Church.⁴⁰

Louis Richard Conradi

Louis Richard Conradi (1856–1939) was born in Germany from where, as a young man of 17, he immigrated to the United States. In 1878 he joined the Seventh-day Adventist Church and studied for the ministry at Battle Creek College. Upon graduating, he worked enthusiastically for the German speaking people in the Midwest. In 1886 the General Conference sent him to work in Europe. With headquarters in Switzerland, he traveled and labored in both Germany and Russia.

After the Minneapolis General Conference of 1888, which he attended, he started work in Hamburg. When Germany and Russia were separated from the Central European Conference in 1891, they were placed under Conradi's direction. Ten years later he became the first chairman of the General European Conference, and in 1903 he became vice president of the General Conference. Later, as president of the European Division, he remained head of our work in Europe until 1922.

In addition to directing the work in Europe, he traveled widely in other parts of the world field, including Africa, the Middle East, South America, and the Far East. Conradi was a forceful speaker, and despite his administrative duties and itinerating, he was a rather prolific writer and wrote several books in both English and German, among them a revised enlargement of J. N. Andrews' *History of the Sabbath*, and an exposition of the books of Daniel and the Revelation.

Conradi was a capable leader, and Elder A. G. Daniells, president of the General Conference, greatly appreciated his leadership. In 1910 Daniells made this observation about Conradi: "He is a scholar, and a man of very keen foresight, of much insight; and he is building up a work in Europe that is simply marvelous; and he is building it on the old solid foundation of this cause. He is not wandering about."⁴¹

Conradi's doubts with reference to the denomination's sanctuary teaching began early and rested chiefly on the Seventh-day Adventist interpretation of [Daniel 8:13–14](#). As an avid student of history, Conradi revived the Reformation teaching that [Daniel 8:13](#) refers to a papal counterfeit of Christ's mediatorial work and that [Daniel 8:14](#) points to a rediscovery of Christ's saving ministry designated in this passage by the "daily."⁴² With reference to the three angels' messages of [Revelation 14:6–7](#), he believed that the "first angel's message is the message of grace that went to the world after rejection of Jesus; the second angel's message is description of apostasy; and the third is the announcement of God's wrath unmixed with mercy."⁴³

He further believed that the 2300 days have nothing to do with the cleansing of a heavenly sanctuary; they refer to Islam. About this he said: "The Lord avenged Himself on Islam because it suppressed God's people in the East, elevated Mohammed as the false prophet above Christ, and defiled the temple rite until today. He did this at the end of the 2300 year-days, in that He compelled the Turk, in 1844, to exercise tolerance toward all who would be Christians."⁴⁴ He finally came to believe that the Seventh-day Adventist doctrine of an investigative judgment was mere fiction.⁴⁵

Although Conradi had cherished and nurtured divergent views on the sanctuary and the investigative judgment for decades, his dissenting views first came to the fore in an article he, as editor, published in *Herold der Wahrheit*, May 1931. This eventually led to a hearing of his views on October 13–16, 1931, by a committee of 27 at the Omaha, Nebraska, Autumn Council. The committee was appointed by the General Conference Committee and included all the officers of the General Conference. The interviewing committee deemed Conradi's views on the sanctuary unacceptable.

As a result, it was mutually agreed that Conradi would surrender every office held in the church by the end of that year and would tender his resignation as field secretary of the General Conference at the Council, or later to the General Conference Committee, and that he would refrain from unsettling believers either by written or oral presentations. From January 1, 1932, he would be granted sustentation and would retain his credentials as long as he complied with the agreed-upon conditions.

When Conradi began to present his divergent views by voice and pen, thus unsettling church members, the Central European Division Committee, on August 2, 1932, voted to recommend to the General Conference that Conradi's credentials be withdrawn. This recommendation was received by cablegram at the General Conference headquarters in Washington, DC, on August 13.⁴⁶ This led to his separation from the Seventh-day Adventist Church.⁴⁷

Unlike Ballenger who modified the Seventh-day Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary, Fletcher and Conradi came to the place where they rejected it *in toto*. They also joined other religious associations upon leaving the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Fletcher associated with the Sidney Bible Training Institute and the Free Evangelical Fellowship,⁴⁸ and Conradi, after more than half a century as a Seventh-day Adventist minister and administrator, became a Seventh Day Baptist minister.⁴⁹

There may be some connection between the inability of Ballenger, Fletcher, and Conradi to accept the Seventh-day Adventist teachings on the sanctuary and their failure to harmonize successfully Ellen G. White's statements with the teachings of the Bible. Ballenger was ambivalent with reference to the Spirit of Prophecy. Fletcher rejected Ellen White as being the special messenger of the Lord to the remnant church. Conradi avowed a partial acceptance. At the hearing on October 16, 1931, in Omaha he stated that "when Sister White tells us how we ought to live, then I accept such counsel. But when it comes to matters of doctrine, then this is another matter altogether."⁵⁰

These three men—Ballenger, Fletcher, and Conradi—had studied and thought through the Seventh-day Adventist teachings on the investigative judgment and decided that they could not find a personally satisfactory biblical foundation for them. Consequently, they parted ways with the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

E. B. Jones

A more recently disaffected worker did not ground his separation from the Seventh-day Adventist Church on doctrinal differences but on dissatisfaction with the church in general. Having left the Seventh-day Adventist Church fellowship, however, he raised objections to its sanctuary doctrine.

E. B. Jones (fl. 1919–1949) was a former Seventh-day Adventist missionary publishing house manager in India. For some time he had vacillated in his beliefs, and after his recall from his mission appointment, he severed his connections with the Seventh-day Adventist Church in September, 1943, and joined the First Baptist Church of Minneapolis. Two years later he was ordained to the Baptist ministry.⁵¹

Jones objected to a division of the heavenly sanctuary into two apartments. He writes "that the veil of the sanctuary represented the flesh of Christ (see [Heb 10:20](#)). It follows inevitably that, since the veil represents the flesh of Christ, the two apartments on earth did not represent two apartments in heaven. The incarnate Christ stands between God and man today just as the veil intervened between God and man in the tabernacle of old."⁵² He further rejected the idea that the prophecy of [Daniel 8:13–14](#) has anything to do with the beginning of an investigative judgment in heaven and the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary in 1844.⁵³ To Jones, like Canright and Conradi who also joined Baptist churches upon leaving the Seventh-day Adventist Church, the very notion that the records of the sins of the redeemed must first be reviewed before being permanently blotted out some 1800 years after Christ's death on the cross was abhorrent. He wrote, "One who believes the 'investigative judgment' doctrine of Adventism cannot have a true conception of the gospel, much less enjoy its blessings. The two are as opposite to each other as sin to righteousness.... Everyone who really knows and believes the gospel has the assurance that he is 'accepted in the Beloved'; he knows that he has been saved. How can one enjoy the Good News of salvation if he must wait until God examines the books to see whether he is worthy of receiving it?"⁵⁴

External Challengers

While the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary teachings have proved a stumbling block to some church members, and even to some leaders within the church, it appears to be the most formidable barrier between Seventh-day Adventists and other evangelical Christians. Evangelicals in general find it difficult to believe that the records of forgiven sins will remain in the heavenly sanctuary until a preadvent investigative judgment that began in 1844. Even among those who regard us charitably and count us as Christian brethren, there is no tolerance of this unique doctrine. Among such are Walter R. Martin and Donald G. Barnhouse.

Walter R. Martin

Walter R. Martin in his book *The Truth About Seventh-day Adventism*,⁵⁵ objects strongly to our view of the sanctuary. He understands that the sanctuary teaching is “the very heart of Seventh-day Adventist teaching relative to the expiation of sin” and that according to it “the sins of believers have been transferred, deposited or recorded in the heavenly sanctuary, and are now being dealt with in the investigative judgment.”⁵⁶ He notes that for Seventh-day Adventists the investigative judgment is the final blotting out of sins.

Martin believes that the early Seventh-day Adventists fabricated the doctrine about the heavenly sanctuary and its cleansing “to compensate for errors in prophetic interpretation” after the disappointment of October 22, 1844. He says they transferred the location of the sanctuary from earth to heaven and taught that on October 22 Christ went from the first to the Second Apartment of the sanctuary. In the Second Apartment, he notes, Seventh-day Adventists teach that Jesus is reviewing the cases of those deemed to be worthy of eternal life. He labels this “a unique Arminian-type theory, intended,” he believes, “to discipline Christians by the threat of impending judgment and condemnation.”⁵⁷ His verdict is that “some tenets of Christian theology as historically understood and the interpretations of Mrs. White do not agree; indeed, they are at loggerheads.... We must disagree with Mrs. White’s interpretation of the sanctuary, the investigative judgment and the scapegoat.”⁵⁸ “Holding as they [Seventh-day Adventists] do to the doctrine of the investigative judgment, it is extremely difficult for us to understand how they can experience the joy of salvation and the knowledge of sins forgiven.”⁵⁹

Donald G. Barnhouse

To Donald G. Barnhouse the Seventh-day Adventist doctrine of the sanctuary “is most certainly exegetically untenable and theologically speculation of a highly imaginative order.... We personally do not believe that there is even a suspicion of a verse in Scripture to sustain such a peculiar position, and we further believe that any effort to establish it is *stale, flat, and unprofitable!*” He goes on labeling the doctrine of the investigative judgment as “unimportant and almost naive.”⁶⁰

Baptists, and others coming out of the Calvinistic heritage, and dispensationalists in general, naturally loathe the very thought that a person’s salvation is not eternally secure after he has once accepted Christ as his Saviour. Persons who are not able even to conceive of the possibility that a Christian can forfeit his status as a child of God but possesses eternal security forever after once accepting Christ as his Saviour, find it not only difficult but impossible even to imagine that a person’s sins, though forgiven, will still remain on God’s books until a preadvent judgment. They find the Seventh-day Adventist teaching about an investigative judgment, centered in the heavenly sanctuary, incompatible with their concept of God and His dealings with man and forgiven sins. Characteristic of this mode of thinking are the views of Norman F. Douty, a Baptist clergyman, and onetime president of Grand Rapids Baptist Theological Seminary and Bible College; Anthony H. Hoekema, Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at Calvin Theological Seminary, also at Grand Rapids; and Herbert S. Bird, a former evangelical missionary to Eritrea. These men aptly represent this group and its rejection of the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary doctrine with its alleged impairment of the atonement.⁶¹

Martin and Barnhouse, who acknowledge Seventh-day Adventists as Christian friends, belong philosophically to the same genre as Douty, Hoekema, and Bird. All three, together with futurists, reject the year-day principle with a historicist interpretation of Daniel 8:14 and the 2300 days. With this, of course, goes the cleansing of the sanctuary.⁶²

Norman F. Douty

Douty believes that the sanctuary referred to by Daniel is the earthly sanctuary since it is capable of being trodden underfoot by evil men.⁶³ It also puzzles him that Seventh-day Adventists divide Christ’s heavenly ministry into two stages, separated by October 22, 1844,⁶⁴ followed by an investigative judgment,⁶⁵ and that we refer to the time between October 22, 1844, and the Parousia as the day of atonement. He wonders about Seventh-day Adventist consistency when Christ, symbolized by the Lord’s goat on the Day of Atonement according to Seventh-day Adventist teachings, shed His atoning blood more than 1800 years ago.⁶⁶

It is Douty’s conviction that the Seventh-day Adventist and Ellen White definition of atonement connected with the sanctuary and the investigative judgment is blurred,⁶⁷ incomplete,⁶⁸ and at best negative and inconsistent.⁶⁹

Anthony H. Hoekema

Hoekema also believes that acceptance of the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary and the investigative judgment doctrine makes it impossible for Seventh-day Adventists to believe in salvation by grace. He says that “while seeking to maintain that men are saved by grace alone, Seventh-day Adventists have cast a shadow over that claim by their view of the investigative judgment.”⁷⁰ It seems to him that Seventh-day Adventists teach that this judgment “*determines* whether a person shall be saved or not,” and that “the investigative judgment doctrine impugns the sovereignty of God, since it implies that neither God the Father nor Christ knows who are truly God’s people until after this examination has been concluded. This distinction between the forgiveness of sins and the blotting out of sins which Seventh-day Adventists make jeopardizes the security of the child of God, and makes it impossible for anyone to know, even in the hour of his death, whether he is saved or not.”⁷¹

He reaches the conclusion that “in the last analysis, the Adventists teach that it is not the work of Jesus Christ done once for all on the cross, but their faithful keeping of God’s commandments and their faithful confessing of every single sin that determine whether they are saved or lost. Sinful deeds committed subsequently to their having accepted Christ may cause God to cancel His forgiveness.”⁷²

He correctly observes about us that we “teach that, though one is justified by grace alone, through believing in Christ and having His righteousness imputed to us, it is possible for a person through subsequent sinful deeds and attitudes, to lose this justification and still be eternally lost,”⁷³ and that Seventh-day Adventists believe that “the decisive factor in determining who will be saved is thus not God’s sovereign grace but man’s free choice.”⁷⁴ Bird echoes this same sentiment by saying that the Seventh-day Adventist “sanctuary position” “evinces a notion of the way of salvation which is considerably less than all of grace.”⁷⁵ Their Calvinism is showing!

It is easy for Hoekema to fault the investigative judgment doctrine since he believes it “arose as the result of a mistake.”⁷⁶ “The conclusion is inescapable,” he says, “that Seventh-day Adventist teaching on the investigative judgment was simply a way out of an embarrassing predicament,”⁷⁷ when the Millerite prediction of Christ’s return in glory on October 22, 1844, did not occur. He notes that Miller admitted he was mistaken in his calculation but that the group that developed into the Seventh-day Adventist Church reinterpreted Miller’s prediction and applied it to Christ’s entering into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary in order to cleanse it. Thus he concludes that “the doctrine of the investigative judgment, therefore, one of the key doctrines of Seventh-day Adventism, was a doctrine built on a mistake.”⁷⁸

Conclusion

The challengers of the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary/investigative judgment doctrine base their objections to it on two bases: (1) They seem to fail to find adequate biblical support for it. They agree with Barnhouse when he says that “ideas of investigative judgment and a secondary sanctuary ministry have no basis in Scripture.”⁷⁹ (2) It casts a shadow over or neutralizes in their eyes the all-sufficient atonement of Jesus on the cross and “impugns the sovereignty of God, since it implies that neither God the Father nor Christ knows who are truly God’s people until after this examination.”⁸⁰ They believe, as Bird expresses it, that “During this investigative judgment, Christ is making a very careful examination of the records to see whether those who accepted Him are still worthy. Thus the judgment is for the purpose of ascertaining, before the final hour, who are entitled to the benefits of Christ’s atonement.”⁸¹

For the biblical basis of the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary/investigative judgment doctrine we refer to other studies.⁸² The second objection that it virtually invalidates the atonement and makes of no effect the shed blood of Christ, stems from their failure to grasp the concept of the great controversy that continues in the universe between God and Satan.

This controversy began with Lucifer’s rebellion in heaven. With his ouster from heaven the conflict was transferred to this earth (see [Rev 12:7–9](#)). It has raged ever since and will not end until Satan, sin, and sinners are blotted out in the lake of fire (see [Rev 20:7–10](#)) and complete atonement (at-one-ment, oneness, unity, harmony) is restored in the universe.

But before the great controversy will end it must become evident to all heavenly intelligences on what basis some people will experience annihilation while others will be privileged to live in the presence of God throughout eternity. This will be made clear during the investigative judgment. The purpose of this preadvent judgment is not, as our challengers erroneously assume, to determine “whether a person shall be saved or not,”⁸³ as Hoekema puts it.

Possibly the term investigative judgment is infelicitous since it may connote that decisions as to a person’s destiny are being made during it. But such is not the case. Probably it might more correctly be called an audit. An audit of paid financial bills just verifies that the debts have been liquidated. No decisions are made in an audit. The audit is just confirmatory. The investigative judgment might therefore more appropriately be called the preadvent heavenly audit.

The purpose of the heavenly audit—not judgment—is not for the benefit of God. He is omniscient. He knows those who have accepted Jesus as their Saviour: “The Lord knows those who are his” ([2 Tim 2:19](#)), and Jesus Himself says, “I know my own and my own know me” ([John 10:14](#)). He also knows those who remained faithful to Him to the end (see [Matt 24:13](#)). Such do not come into judgment. Jesus assures us, “Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life; he does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life” ([John 5:24](#)). The Father loves His blood-bought children. He gave His Son for the redemption of those He created. All those who have remained in a faith relationship with Jesus are already eternally safe and secure. The Father and Son are eager to take their loyal followers back into heaven’s sinless society. And the purpose of the preadvent audit is to verify before all angels, both loyal and fallen, their continuing faith-relationship with Jesus before they are raised in the first resurrection (see [Rev 20:6](#)) and taken to the mansions prepared for them (see [John 14:1–3](#)). On the other hand, the preadvent heavenly audit will mean condemnation to such who once were in Christ Jesus but chose not to remain in that faith relationship. And there are such as King Saul in OT times (see [1 Sam 10:6–10](#)) and others who claimed to be in Christ but were not (see [Matt 7:21–23](#)).

Anyone who has remained steadfast and faithful in his committal to God has nothing to fear. “There is ... no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus” ([Rom 8:1](#)). Jesus is his advocate, and his case has already been settled. In this audit the believer’s lifelong loyalty to Jesus is only confirmed. On the man of faith—the person who has thrown himself upon the mercy of God and accepted Jesus as his Saviour and been justified by faith—his judgment of acquittal has already been guaranteed. Jesus secured his acquittal at Calvary, and the believer has claimed that acquittal by faith. The believer’s eternal destiny depends on his continuous faith-relationship with Jesus.

The redemption, or deliverance, experienced in coming to Jesus and being saved is like being discharged from a hospital. During a patient’s hospital stay the hospital personnel check his temperature, blood pressure, and heartbeat, etc., and record them several times a day. On his discharge from the hospital those records remain in the medical records library of the hospital even though the patient has regained his health and been discharged and sent home well. Certainly those records do not worry the well patient. In the same way the person who has given his life to Christ rejoices in his forgiveness of sin and the gift of eternal life, knowing that as far as he is concerned they are blotted out and separated from him as far as the east is from the west.

The challengers to our sanctuary/atonement doctrine are prone to think that our teaching of an investigative judgment or a preadvent heavenly audit implies only provisional forgiveness. But there is nothing provisional about it. A discharged patient is restored to health. The record of his past illness is not synonymous with illness. So a preadvent heavenly audit does not imply that the redeemed need to be cleared of guilt.

Our critics and challengers fail to discern the divisibility between sin and the record of sin. Hence they believe that the Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary/atonement doctrine impairs the surety of a person’s salvation. But this it most assuredly does not do. The Scriptures do teach that sins can be forgiven although the record of sin remains. The record of sin is not destroyed at the time sin is forgiven. Ezekiel apparently has this in mind when he says, “But when a righteous man turns away from his righteousness and commits iniquity and does the same abominable things that the wicked man does, shall he live? None of the righteous deeds which he has done shall be remembered; for the treachery of which he is guilty and the sin he has committed, he shall die” ([Ezek 18:24](#)).

Jesus teaches this same truth even more lucidly in the parable of the two debtors in [Matthew 18:24–35](#). Even though the first servant had been forgiven his huge debt of ten thousand talents, when he failed to share his master’s forgiving attitude and refused to forgive his fellow servant who owed him only one hundred pence, the king’s forgiveness was withdrawn and his huge debt returned to him. The record of his debt had not been destroyed with the cancellation of his debt. It remained, and therefore his debt could be returned to him in full. Sin and the record of sin are divisible.

The sanctuary/atonement doctrine does not invalidate or put a person’s salvation in doubt. Rather, it confirms it and makes it even more sure. Satan and his followers during this preadvent audit will verify the records of the redeemed and note that they have remained in Jesus Christ until the end. The saving connection has not been broken; they have remained in the vine. Nor will the angels of heaven ever question the worthiness of the redeemed. The Seventh-day Adventist sanctuary/atonement doctrine with the teaching of an investigative judgment or preadvent heavenly audit will vindicate and forever establish both God’s justice and mercy. The myriads of angels assembled around the throne of God at His preadvent audit (see [Dan 7:9–10](#)) will in the end extol God’s fairness and justice by singing:

Great and wonderful art thy deeds,
O Lord God the Almighty!
Just and true are thy ways,
O King of the ages! ([Rev 15:3](#)).

Statement on Desmond Ford Document*

Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980

After study of Dr. Desmond Ford's document "Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment," the following preliminary report regarding the validity of some of the author's views is submitted:

First, we express appreciation to Dr. Ford for his many years of diligent service for the church. We recognize his talents as a teacher and preacher. His ministry has stimulated the minds of thousands of students and believers. His wealth of knowledge and personal life-style have been the source of blessing for many.

We gratefully acknowledge the author's deep concern that our presentation of the sanctuary doctrine be done in such a manner as to "recommend it to the best minds of non-Adventists, as well as our own people, and be able to survive the most searching scrutiny" (p. 5).

We further acknowledge that his manuscript has encouraged a deeper and more careful examination of the biblical foundation for our traditional view of the sanctuary doctrine. However, while we have gladly and with good intention stated some of the positive aspects of the author's ministry, we must in fairness state that some of his activities have been neither a source of strength nor in the best interests of our church.

We feel it necessary to state that we cannot agree with certain views set forth in his document, which we regard as major aspects of his theological position on the sanctuary doctrine. These disagreements are as follows:

1. Methodology. We recognize the enormous amount of time and energy the author has invested in his document, which with appendixes constitutes a sizable work of nearly 1,000 pages. However, because of the size of the manuscript, with its numerous footnotes and references, which will be impressive if not coercive to many readers, we feel it imperative to make a statement on its accuracy.

After a preliminary examination of the author's use of references and sources, we find that in various instances they have either been taken out of context or used indiscriminately and thus not in harmony with the quoted writers' original intent. This is true of both secular and Spirit of Prophecy statements.

2. The Day of Atonement in the book of Hebrews. In his position paper, Dr. Ford asserts emphatically that the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches that the risen Christ, by virtue of His own blood or sacrificial death, entered into the heavenly Most Holy Place at His ascension (pp. 187, 195). The cleansing of "the heavenly things" mentioned in [Hebrews 9:23](#), he also believes, applies only to the initial New Testament period (pp. 169, 191).

The Day of Atonement sacrifice, as well as the other Levitical sacrifices and the high priest's entrance into the Most Holy Place, finds fulfillment, according to Ford, in Christ's death and ascension into the presence of God (p. 253). Christ, then, as the high priest at God's right hand, has opened up a new access and center of worship for the people of God (p. 244).

Ford declares that he can find in Hebrews no allusion to Daniel (p. 169) or any reference to a two-phased ministry of the risen Christ (p. 163). He does affirm, however, the reality of the heavenly sanctuary (p. 240).

There is basic agreement that Christ at His ascension entered into the very presence of God, as symbolized by the earthly high priest's entrance on the Day of Atonement. There is also general acceptance that neither Daniel nor a two-phased ministry are referred to in the Epistle to the Hebrews. But we do deny that His entrance into the presence of God precludes (1) a first-apartment phase of ministry or (2) marks the beginning of the second phase of His ministry.

Ford believes that the heavenly sanctuary intercession of Christ finds a providential crisis in what he understands to be the rediscovery of the gospel through a new appreciation of sanctuary symbolism (p. 260). This rediscovery he relates to the 1844 movement and the visions of Ellen G. White (p. 260). However, Ford denies that Christ's heavenly ministry climaxes in the initiation of a judgment-intercession, beginning in 1844 (pp. 595, 261).

Ford does believe that the Day of Atonement imagery finds fulfillment in judgment—even preadvent judgment—in the book of Revelation (pp. 449, 650). This latter, however, is a declaration at the close of Christ's heavenly intercession just before the Second Advent; it is not a heavenly judicial process beginning in 1844 (p. 595). The proclamation that providentially began in 1844 refers, in Ford's opinion, only to the believer's present decision of faith and the future preadvent judgment, but not to a present judicial process in heaven (pp. 652, 260–261).

This is an unwarranted reduction of Adventist belief.

3. The phrase "Within the Veil" as found in Hebrews 6:19, 20. We acknowledge the insights in Dr. Ford's study of the letter to the Hebrews; however, we disagree with the theological implications he draws from the phrase "within the veil."

We do not believe that the phrase was intended to mean that from the time of His ascension Christ has been engaged in a ministry equivalent to that which the Old Testament high priest performed once a year in the Second Apartment of the tabernacle on the Day of Atonement, to the exclusion of the daily phase of the priestly ministry. "Within the veil," we believe, was intended to convey the conviction that, since Christ's ascension, we have full, free, and direct access to the very presence of God.

The Old Testament believer had limited access to that presence by means of the high priest, who entered with fear and with limited effectiveness the Most Holy Place of the earthly tabernacle once a year. Since our Lord's ascension the believer has had full and free access to the presence of God through Christ. Through His sacrifice on the cross He has opened a new way to the presence of God so that we have continual and confident access to Him.

"Within the veil" refers to this symbolic picture of the presence of God in a first-century application of the Day of Atonement imagery rather than the antitypical fulfillment of the Old Testament type. This way of speaking in no way precludes our understanding of Christ's two-phased mediatorial ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, which the letter to the Hebrews neither teaches nor denies.

4. Year-day principle. While Dr. Ford professes a belief in the year-day principle as a useful tool of biblical interpretation, we regret that he does not see fit to apply the principle to the time prophecies of Daniel. He operates with the presupposition that all Old Testament prophecies were to be fulfilled by the first century A.D., which prevents him from using the year-day principle.

Dr. Ford believes that the year-day tool became a providential discovery "after the Advent hope of the early church had faded away" (p. 294). But coupled with his uncertainty regarding the use of the year-day principle is his uncertainty regarding the dates for the beginning and ending of the time prophecies in Daniel (pp. 320, 321, 344).

Because Ford believes that the year-day principle was not God's original intent for Daniel's time prophecies, he believes its present use, in harmony with God's "providential" arrangement, should not be with punctiliar precision.

We believe, however, that the year-day principle is a valid hermeneutical tool and called for by the context containing the time prophecies. When the context relates to historical narrative with literal people, literal time periods are used in [Daniel 1, 3, 5](#), and [6](#). In the apocalyptic passages, when time periods accompany symbolic figures, it is natural and appropriate to expect those time periods also to be symbolic in nature. Numerous other reasons help the prophetic interpreter to distinguish between literal and symbolic time.

We further believe that all of the apocalyptic prophecies in which time elements are found have stood the pragmatic test. That is, their predicted events did occur at the intervals expected, according to the application of the year-day principle.

In reference to [Daniel 8:13, 14](#), we believe that the context requires the use of the year-day principle, and thus a fulfillment beginning in 457 B.C. and ending in A.D. 1844.

We thus reject Dr. Ford's assertion that [Daniel 8:14](#) "applies also to every revival of true religion where the elements of the kingdom of God, mirrored in the sanctuary by the stone tablets and the mercy seat, are proclaimed afresh, as at 1844" (p. 356).

5. Apotelesmatic principle. Dr. Ford uses the apotelesmatic principle to affirm that "a prophecy fulfilled, or fulfilled in part, or unfulfilled at the appointed time, may have a later or recurring, or consummated fulfillment" (p. 485).

In short, by his usage of this hermeneutical principle, Dr. Ford is able to accept multiple reinterpretations and applications of prophetic symbols and statements. Almost a corollary to this principle is the author's borrowed axiom: "All are right in what they affirm and wrong in what they deny" (p. 505).

We reject the use of this axiom, whether explicit or implied, because with its use no positively stated assertion could ever contradict another positively stated assertion. With this guiding axiom coupled with the apotelesmatic principle, the author says that all prophetic interpretations by all four prophetic schools—preterists, historicists, futurists, and idealists—are correct (ibid.).

When he applies the apotelesmatic principle to [Daniel 8:13, 14](#), we discover that the original meaning or purpose of these verses should have been fulfilled sometime after the postexilic restoration. If the Jewish nation had been faithful in proclaiming the gospel, and thus preparing the world for the Messiah, "that Messiah would have been confronted at His coming by the eschatological tyrant Antichrist ('little horn'). Antichrist would have been successful in his initial warfare against God's people and truth for 2300 days, but then Christ would have brought him to his end, with none to help him. Having broken Antichrist 'without hand' the kingdom of the Rock of Ages would have become God's holy mountain filling the whole earth for eternity" (p. 485).

In this brief scenario, Dr. Ford has interpreted, by means of the apotelesmatic principle, [Daniel 2, 7, 8, 9](#), and [11](#). He could do it only by denying the year-day principle and the historicist method of interpretation.

However, though Israel was not faithful, the "main idea" of Daniel's prophecies would yet be fulfilled "in principle" in later events (ibid.). Thus, the "little horn," for example, would be fulfilled in Antiochus Epiphanes, in pagan Rome, and in Satan's manifestation just before and after the millennium. Each of these entities would experience judgment and be destroyed with none to help them, thus "fulfilling" "in principle" the intent of Daniel's prophecies. "These successive judgments were predicted by 'then shall the sanctuary be justified.' Every era of revival of the truths symbolized in the sanctuary may claim to be a fulfillment of [Daniel 8:14](#)" (p. 486).

Although we recognize the possibility of more than one fulfillment (when the context requires it or when a later inspired writer makes the application), we must reject Ford's usage of the apotelesmatic principle, because it lacks external control. Any principle of interpretation that permits any prophecy to mean many things is not a helpful tool.

6. Use of *šādaq* in Daniel 8:14. The niphil use of the root *šādaq* in [Daniel 8:14](#) is unique in the Old Testament. Though the basic meaning of the root *šādaq* is "to be right," "to justify," "to restore," the semantic range of this root includes the meaning "to cleanse." This is evident from (1) the use of *šādaq* with *ṭāhēr* ("to cleanse," "to purify"; e.g., in [Job 4:17](#)) in synonymous parallelism and *zākāh* ("to cleanse," "to purify"; e.g., in [Job 15:14](#)), (2) the translation of *šādaq* in several versions, and (3) the hithpael use of the root *šādaq* (the hithpael, like the niphil, is passive or reflexive) in [Genesis 44:16](#).

Though Ford, in a number of places in his document, allows for the translation *šādaq* in [Daniel 8:14](#) as "to cleanse" (p. 348), he also remarks categorically in his listing of the church's assumptions for its interpretation of the sanctuary: "That 'cleansed' is an accurate translation in [Daniel 8:14](#). (*Though this is certainly not the case*)" (p. 290, italics ours).

While we agree with Ford that there does not appear to be an explicit verbal link between *šādaq* of [Daniel 8:14](#) and [Leviticus 16](#), it seems that he does not give due weight to the meaning "to cleanse" (which we consider justifiable in the context of [Daniel 8:9–14](#)) and the possibility of a relationship with [Leviticus 16](#), particularly in the light of the common ideas between the two passages.

7. The relationship of Daniel 7, 8, and 9. Dr. Ford claims that [Daniel 9:24–27](#) (the 70-week prophecy) parallels [Daniel 8:14](#) (the 2300-day prophecy) rather than being a segment of the 2300-day prophecy (p. 403). He further suggests that both chapters [9:24–27](#) and [8:14](#) parallel [Daniel 7:9–14](#) (court scene in heaven [pp. 368–376]).

While the apocalyptic time prophecy of [Daniel 8](#) basically parallels that of [Daniel 7](#) (as well as [Daniel 2](#)), it also amplifies [Daniel 7](#) considerably. The prophecies of [Daniel 2, 7, and 8](#) began with either Babylon or Persia and take the reader to the end of human history (the eschaton).

However, we do not find the argument valid that [Daniel 9:24–27](#) parallels both [Daniel 7](#) and [Daniel 8:14](#), since the time and subject matter of these passages differ.

8. Antiochus Epiphanes. Regarding the little horn of [Daniel 8](#) and its parallelism in [Daniel 11](#), Dr. Ford holds that "only Antiochus Epiphanes fulfilled the chief specifications of [Daniel 8](#)'s little horn, and the vile person of [Daniel 11](#). All other fulfillments, such as pagan and papal Rome, are fulfillments in principle rather than in detail" (p. 469).

As far as Rome is concerned, he affirms that "all attempts to make Rome as first and major fulfillment of all the specifications of the little horn ignore both the symbolism and the interpretation" (p. 383, italics his). On the contrary, we believe that while Antiochus Epiphanes bears some resemblance to the description of the little horn, pagan and papal Rome fulfill the specifications of this prophetic symbol.

9. Saints in judgment. In the context of a discussion of the judgment of [Daniel 7](#), Dr. Ford's claim that "the Son of man judges the little horn and delivers the beast to the flames" (p. 365), his stress on the judgment of the little horn, and his contention that in [Daniel 7](#) "unbelievers, not believers, are the 'eye' of the storm (i.e., the judgment)" (p. 369) are all dubious.

Nowhere in [Daniel 7](#) does the "Son of man" judge either the little horn or the beast. While it is true that the little horn power, which receives punishment as its reward, is judged indirectly in [Daniel 7](#), it also is clear that God's people, who receive the eternal kingdom after the judgment has sat, are all judged worthy of the ultimate covenant blessings. Both the apocalyptic sections of [Daniel](#) (chaps. [7:21, 22](#) and [12:1–3](#)) and the historical chapters depict God's people on trial (e.g., chapter [1](#), where the Hebrew worthies are on trial; chapter [3](#), where Daniel's friends are tested; chapter [6](#) where Daniel is tried). The judgment reveals those who have retained their intimate covenantal relationship with God. The motif of the judgment of God's people is further supported in numerous instances within classical prophecy.

10. The role of Ellen White in doctrinal understanding. One cannot be a Seventh-day Adventist very long and not recognize that our theology is shaped to a significant degree by the ministry of Ellen G. White. Her philosophy of history as reflected in her "great controversy theme" and her concern for the development of the whole person are but two examples of insights she has provided that have helped to illuminate the Scriptures and to foster serious Bible study within the church.

This means that Seventh-day Adventists recognize in Ellen G. White an authority in doctrine and life that is second only to that of the Scriptures. She was not, nor ever pretended to be, an expert in biblical languages or in other technical disciplines related to biblical interpretation. Yet, as her understanding grew under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, she provided counsel for the church that has helped it to confirm light found in the Word of God and to avoid doctrinal errors that threatened its very existence. The Seventh-day Adventist Church holds the writings of Ellen G. White in the highest regard as a source of doctrinal understanding.

For these reasons we believe that some of Dr. Ford's statements regarding Ellen G. White's ministry to the church in doctrinal areas will be misunderstood. Some Adventists have inferred that in Dr. Ford's view Ellen White's authority does not extend to doctrinal issues. On this point the Seventh-day Adventist position is that a prophet's authority cannot justifiably be limited in this way.

Conclusion

This doctrine of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, this unique teaching of Seventh-day Adventists, invites earnest study on the part of every believer. Our pioneers found it by diligent searching of the Word and became motivated by it. We too must find it for ourselves and make it our own. We must come to realize that "the sanctuary in heaven is the very center of Christ's work in behalf of men," and that His ministry there "is as essential to the plan of salvation as was His death upon the cross" (*The Great Controversy*, pp. 488–489).

As we seek to know and understand Christ in the heavenly sanctuary as fervently as did the first Adventists, we shall experience the revival and reform, the assurance and hope, that come with a clearer view of our great High Priest.

Appendix E

Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary*

(Consensus Document)

Sanctuary Review Committee, 1980

The doctrine of Christ our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary brings us assurance and hope. It invested the lives of the pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church with meaning; it still is a fruitful field for our contemplation and spiritual growth.

This distinctive teaching was reaffirmed in the Statement of Fundamental Beliefs adopted by the General Conference session at Dallas in April 1980. Our continuing conviction was there expressed as follows:

“There is a sanctuary in heaven, the true tabernacle which the Lord set up and not man. In it Christ ministers on our behalf, making available to believers the benefits of His atoning sacrifice offered once for all on the cross. He was inaugurated as our great High Priest and began His intercessory ministry at the time of His ascension. In 1844, at the end of the prophetic period of 2300 days, He entered the second and last phase of His atoning ministry. It is a work of investigative judgment which is part of the ultimate disposition of all sin, typified by the cleansing of the ancient Hebrew sanctuary on the Day of Atonement. In that typical service the sanctuary was cleansed with the blood of animal sacrifices, but the heavenly things are purified with the perfect sacrifice of the blood of Jesus. The investigative judgment reveals to heavenly intelligences who among the dead are asleep in Christ and therefore, in Him, are deemed worthy to have part in the first resurrection. It also makes manifest who among the living are abiding in Christ, keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, and in Him, therefore, are ready for translation into His everlasting kingdom. This judgment vindicates the justice of God in saving those who believe in Jesus. It declares that those who have remained loyal to God shall receive the kingdom. The completion of this ministry of Christ will mark the close of human probation before the Second Advent.”

The present paper is an elaboration of the Dallas statement. It sets forth the consensus of the Sanctuary Review Committee, which convened August 10–15, 1980, at Glacier View, Colorado. The committee sought to make a serious and frank appraisal of our historic positions, evaluating them in the light of criticisms and alternative interpretations that have been suggested. Such suggestions are beneficial in that they drive us to study, force us to clarify our understanding, and thereby lead us to sharper insights and a deeper appreciation of the truths that have shaped the Advent movement.

Thus the doctrine of the sanctuary, which meant so much to early Adventists, shines on believers in our day. To see it more clearly is to see Christ more clearly; and this vision will revive Christian life and give power to our preaching and witness.

I. The Significance of the Doctrine

Although the sanctuary symbolism is prominent throughout Scripture, with Christ as High Priest being the dominant idea of the book of Hebrews, Christian thought has given relatively little attention to this subject. In the nineteenth century, however, there was a sudden flowering of interest in Christ in the heavenly sanctuary. Our pioneers brought together the ideas of Leviticus, Daniel, Hebrews, Revelation, and other scriptures in a unique theological synthesis that combined the high-priesthood of Christ with the expectation of the end of history. Christ was not merely ministering in the sanctuary above; He had entered upon the final phase of that ministry, corresponding to the Day of Atonement of [Leviticus 16](#).

For the earliest Seventh-day Adventists this new doctrine was “the key which unlocked the mystery of the disappointment of 1844” (*The Great Controversy*, p. 423). It was the means by which these firm believers in the imminent return of Jesus could come to terms with their unfulfilled expectations. It gave them a new sense of religious identity; it filled their lives with meaning, for it “opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious, showing that God’s hand had directed the great advent movement and revealing present duty as it brought to light the position and work of His people” (*Ibid.*). Thus they could see that although they had been mistaken, they had not been utterly deluded; they still had a mission and a message.

The belief that Christ is our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary is not a relic from our Adventist past; it illuminates all other doctrines; it brings God and His salvation “near” to us in a way that gives us “full assurance” ([Heb. 10:22](#)); it shows us that God is on our side.

In heaven above there is One who “always lives to make intercession” for us ([Heb 7:25](#), RSV). He is Jesus, our High Priest, who “in the days of his flesh” (chap. 5:7) suffered, endured the test, and died for us. He is able to “sympathize with our weaknesses” (chap. 4:15, RSV) and sends forth timely help from the throne of grace (chap. 2:18; 4:16). So we may come boldly into the presence of God, knowing that we are accepted through the merits of our Mediator.

The doctrine of the sanctuary gives us a new view of ourselves. Humanity, despite its frailties and rebellion, is important to God and is loved supremely by Him. God has shown His regard for us by taking human nature upon Himself, and bearing it forever in the person of Christ, our heavenly High Priest. We are the people of the Priest, the community of God that lives to worship Him and to bring forth fruit to His glory.

This doctrine also opens a new perspective on the world. We see it as part of a cosmic struggle, the “great controversy” between good and evil. The heavenly sanctuary is the divine headquarters in this warfare; it guarantees that eventually evil will be no more, and God will be all and in all ([1 Cor. 15:28](#)). His work of judgment that issues from the sanctuary results in a redeemed people and a re-created world.

II. The Sources of Our Understanding

While the sanctuary theme runs through Scripture, it is seen most clearly in Leviticus, Daniel, Hebrews, and Revelation. These four books, which attracted the attention of the first Adventists, remain the focus of our ongoing study of the sanctuary in heaven.

In terms of emphasis, these books fall into pairs. Whereas Leviticus and Hebrews are concerned primarily with the priestly functions associated with the sanctuary, Daniel and Revelation relate the divine activity in the sanctuary to the end of the world. Thus we may say that a major thrust of the first pair is intercession, while a major thrust of the second is judgment.

The Book of Leviticus describes the various services of the Old Testament sanctuary. We read of the continual sacrifices, presented every morning and evening, for the people of Israel ([Lev. 6:8–13](#)). We read also of several types of individual offerings to express confession, thanksgiving, and consecration (chaps. 1–7). And the climax of the whole system of sacrifices, the Day of Atonement, is described in detail (chap. 16).

The Book of Hebrews compares and contrasts these services with the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on Calvary (chap. 9:1–10:22). It argues that by His once-for-all death Jesus accomplished what Israel’s repeated offerings could never achieve. He is the reality symbolized by the Day of Atonement sacrifices, as by all the ancient services. Although it has been suggested that these references in Hebrews show that the eschatological Day of Atonement began at the cross, Hebrews is not in fact concerned with the question of time; it concentrates rather on the all-sufficiency of Calvary. For answers to our questions regarding the timing of events in the heavenly sanctuary, we look to the books of Daniel and Revelation. In particular the “time prophecies” of [Daniel 7](#) to [9](#) remain crucial for the Adventist understanding of the sanctuary. They point beyond the first advent of Christ to God’s final work of judgment from the heavenly sanctuary.

The precise meaning of the Old Testament prophecies is a matter that calls for ongoing study. This investigation must seek to be true to the varied nature of the individual prophecies, to take account of the differing perspectives of the readers (in Old Testament, New Testament, and modern times), to discern the divine intent in the prophecies, and to maintain the tension between divine sovereignty and human freedom. Furthermore, this study must give due weight to the strong and widespread sense of the imminent Second Advent that we find in the New Testament (e.g., [Rom. 13:11–12](#); [1 Cor 7:29–31](#); [Rev. 22:20](#)).

The writings of Ellen White also contain much material dealing with Christ in the heavenly sanctuary (e.g., *The Great Controversy*, pp. 409–432, 479–491, 582–678). They highlight the significance of the events of 1844 in the divine plan, and the final events that proceed from the throne of God. These writings, however, were not the source of our pioneers’ doctrine of the sanctuary; rather, they confirmed and supplemented the ideas that the early Adventists were finding in the Bible itself. Today we recognize the same relationship: the writings of Ellen White provide confirmation of our doctrine of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary and supplement our understanding of it.

In the remainder of this paper, we offer a brief explanation of this doctrine. The biblical material on which the doctrine is based falls into two related phases. We turn to the first of these: intercession.

III. The Intercessory Ministry of Christ

The Old Testament sacrificial system was given by God. It was the way of salvation by faith for those times, educating the people of God to the dreadful character of sin and pointing forward to God's way of bringing sin to an end.

But there was no efficacy in these multiplied sacrifices as such. Sin is a moral offense, not to be resolved by the slaughter of animals. "It is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins" ([Heb. 10:4](#), RSV). In Jesus Christ alone can sin be removed. Not only is He our High Priest, He also is our Sacrifice. He is "the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world" ([John 1:29](#), RSV), the Passover Lamb sacrificed for us ([1 Cor. 5:7](#)), God's appointed One whose blood is an expiation for the sins of all humanity ([Rom. 3:21–25](#)).

In the light of Jesus Christ all the services of the Old Testament sanctuary find their true meaning. Now we know that the Hebrew sanctuary itself was but a figure, a symbol of the true sanctuary "which is set up not by man but by the Lord" ([Heb. 8:2](#), RSV; [9:24](#)), a far more glorious reality than our minds can comprehend (*Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 357). Now we know that all the Levitical priests and Aaronic high priests were but prefigurations of the One who is the great High Priest because He is in Himself both God and man (chap. 5:1–10). Now we know that the blood of animals carefully selected so as to be without blemish or spot (e.g., [Lev. 1:3, 10](#)), was a symbol of the blood of the Son of God, who would, by dying for us, purify us of sin ([1 Peter 1:18–19](#)).

This first phase of the heavenly ministry of Christ is not a passive one. As our Mediator, Jesus continually applies the benefits of His sacrifice for us. He directs the affairs of the church ([Rev. 1:12–20](#)). He sends forth the Spirit ([John 16:7](#)). He is the leader of the forces of right in the great conflict with Satan ([Rev. 19:11–16](#)). He receives the worship of heaven (chap. 5:11–14). He upholds the universe ([Heb. 1:3](#); [Rev. 3:21](#)).

All blessings flow from the continuing efficacy of Christ's sacrifice. The Book of Hebrews highlights its two great achievements: it provides unhindered access to the presence of God, and it thoroughly removes sin.

Despite the importance of the Old Testament sanctuary, it represented limited access to God. Only those born to the priesthood could enter it ([Heb. 9:1–7](#)). But in the heavenly sanctuary Christ has opened for us the door to the very presence of God; by faith we come boldly to the throne of grace (chap. 4:14–16; also [7:19](#); [10:29–39](#); [12:18–24](#)). Thus the privileges of every Christian are greater even than those of the high priests of the Old Testament.

There is no intermediate step in our approach to God. Hebrews stresses the fact that our great High Priest is at the very right hand of God (chap. 1:3), in "heaven itself ... in the presence of God" (chap. 9:24). The symbolic language of the Most Holy Place, "within the veil," is used to assure us of our full, direct, and free access to God (chaps. 6:19–20; 9:24–28; 10:1–4).

And now there is no need for further offerings and sacrifices. The Old Testament sacrifices were "imperfect"—that is, incomplete, unable to make a final end of sin (chap. 9:9). The very repetition of the sacrifices signified their inadequacy (chap. 10:1–4). In contrast, God's appointed Sacrifice accomplished what the old ones could not, and thus brought them to an end (chap. 9:13–14). "Every priest stands daily at his service, offering repeatedly the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But when Christ had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God" (chap. 10:11–12, RSV).

So Calvary is of abiding consequence. Unlike any other event in history, it is unchanging in its power. It is eternally present, because Jesus Christ, who died for us, continues to make intercession for us in the heavenly sanctuary (chap. 7:25).

This is why the New Testament rings with confidence. With such a High Priest, with such a Sacrifice, with such intercession, we have "full assurance" (chap. 10:22). Our confidence is not in ourselves—in what we have done or what we can do—but in Him and what He has done and still does.

This assurance can never take lightly the Sacrifice that has provided it. As we by faith look to Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary—our sanctuary—and the services He there performs, we are empowered by the Spirit to live holy lives and provide an urgent witness to the world. We know that it is a fearful thing to despise the blood that has redeemed us (chaps. 6:4–6; 10:26–31; 12:15–17).

The final phase of Christ's ministry in the heavenly sanctuary is that of judgment, vindication, and cleansing. We should be clear, however, that while Christ is Judge, He is still our Intercessor. We look first at the time of the judgment and then at its nature.

IV. The Time of the Judgment

The prophetic period of 2300 days ([Dan. 8:14](#)) remains a cornerstone of the Adventist understanding of the final judgment. Although this part of our doctrine of the sanctuary is the one most frequently questioned, careful study of the criticisms in the light of the Scriptures confirms its importance and validity.

Three aspects of this prophecy, especially, have been called into question: the year-day relationship; the meaning of the word translated "cleansed" ([Dan. 8:4](#), KJV) and its connection with the Day of Atonement ([Lev. 16](#)); and the context of the prophecy.

The year-day relationship can be biblically supported, although it is not explicitly identified as a principle of prophetic interpretation. It seems obvious, however, that certain prophetic time periods are not meant to be taken literally (e.g., the short periods in [Revelation 11:9, 11](#)). Furthermore, the Old Testament provides illustrations of a year-day interchangeability in symbolism ([Gen. 29:27](#); [Num. 14:34](#); [Eze. 4:6](#); [Dan. 9:24–27](#)). The year-day relationship also is recognizable in the interlocking of [Daniel 8](#) and [9](#). Additional support is found from parallel prophecies of the 1260 days-years in Daniel and Revelation ([Dan. 7:25](#); [Rev. 12:14](#); [13:5](#)). Since the prophecy of [Daniel 8](#) is parallel to those of chapters 2, 7, and 11–12, all of which culminate in the kingdom of God at the end of history, it is proper to expect the period represented by the 2300 days to reach to the end time ([Dan. 8:17](#)). This is made possible for us by the exegetical application of the year-day relationship.

According to many older versions of the Bible, at the end of the 2300 days the sanctuary is to be "cleansed." The Hebrew word here is *nitsdaq*, which has a broad range of possible meanings. Its basic idea is "make right," "justify," "vindicate," or "restore"; but "purify" and "cleanse" may be included within its conceptual range. In [Daniel 8:14](#) it is evident that the word denotes the reversal of the evil caused by the power symbolized by the "little horn," and hence probably should be translated "restore." While there is, therefore, not a strong verbal link between this verse and the Day of Atonement ritual of [Leviticus 16](#), the passages are, nevertheless, related by their parallel ideas of rectifying the sanctuary from the effects of sin.

[Daniel 8](#) presents the contextual problem of how to relate exegetically the cleansing of the sanctuary at the end of the 2300 days with the activities of the "little horn" during the 2300 days. This wicked power casts down the place of the sanctuary ([Dan. 8:11](#)) and thus occasions the need for its restoration or purification. The "little horn," however, is on earth, whereas we understand the sanctuary to be in heaven. But a careful study of [Daniel 8:9–26](#) points to a solution of this difficulty. It becomes clear that heaven and earth are interrelated, so that the attacks of the "little horn" have a cosmic, as well as historical, significance. In this way we may see how the restoration of the heavenly sanctuary corresponds to—and is a reversal of—the earthly activity of the "little horn." But while we believe that our historic interpretation of [Daniel 8:14](#) is valid, we wish to encourage ongoing study of this important prophecy.

Our conviction that the end of the prophetic period of 2300 days in 1844 marks the beginning of a work of judgment in heaven is supported by the parallelism of [Daniel 8](#) with [Daniel 7](#), which explicitly describes such a work, and by the references to heavenly judgment in the Book of Revelation (chaps. 6:10; 11:18; 14:7; 20:12–13).

Thus our study reinforces our belief that we have indeed come to the time of preadvent judgment, which historically we have termed the "investigative judgment." We hear again God's call to proclaim the everlasting gospel around the world because "the hour of his judgment is come" (chap. 14:6–7).

V. The Nature of Judgment

The teaching of "judgment to come" has a firm base in Scripture ([Eccl. 12:14](#); [John 16:8–11](#); [Acts 24:25](#); [Heb. 9:27](#); etc.). For the believer in Jesus Christ, the doctrine of judgment is solemn but reassuring, because the judgment is God's own intervention in the course of human history to make all things right. It is the unbeliever who finds the teaching a subject of terror.

The work of divine judgment that issues from the heavenly sanctuary has two aspects: One centers in God's people on earth; the other involves the whole universe as God brings to a successful conclusion the great struggle between good and evil.

Scripture tells us that we "must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ" ([2 Cor. 5:10](#)), and that we are to give account for even the "idle word" ([Matt. 12:36](#)). This aspect of the end-time events reveals who are God's (see *The Great Controversy*, pp. 479–491). The overarching question concerns the decision we have made with respect to Jesus, the Saviour of the world. To have accepted His death on our behalf is to have passed already from death to life, from condemnation to salvation; to have rejected Him is to be self-condemned ([John 3:17–18](#)). So this end-time judgment at the close of the 2300-day period reveals our relationship to Christ, disclosed in the totality of our decisions. It indicates the outworking of grace in our lives as we have responded to His gift of salvation; it shows that we belong to Him.

The work of judging the saints is part of the final eradication of sin from the universe ([Jer. 31:34](#); [Dan. 12:1](#); [Rev. 3:5](#); [21:27](#)). At the close of probation, just before the final events in the history of our earth, the people of God will be confirmed in righteousness ([Rev. 22:11](#)). The divine activity from the heavenly sanctuary (chap. 15:1–8) will issue in the sequence of events that at length will purge the universe of all sin and Satan, its originator.

For the child of God, knowledge of Christ's intercession in the judgment brings assurance, not anxiety. He knows that One stands in his behalf, and that the work of judgment is in the hands of his Intercessor ([John 5:22–27](#)). In the righteousness of Christ the Christian is secure in the judgment ([Rom. 8:1](#)). Moreover, the judgment heralds the hour of transition from faith to sight, from earthly care and frustration to eternal joy and fulfillment in the presence of God.

God's judgment, however, is concerned with more than our personal salvation; it is cosmic in scope. It unmasks evil and all evil systems. It exposes hypocrisy and deceit. It restores the rule of right to the universe. Its final word is a new heaven and a new earth, in which righteousness dwells ([2 Peter 3:13](#)), one pure song of love from Creation to creation (*ibid.*, pp. 662–678).

And in this act of divine judgment, God Himself is shown to be absolutely just. The universal response to His final acts from the heavenly sanctuary is, "Great and wonderful are thy deeds, O Lord God the Almighty! Just and true are thy ways, O King of the ages!" ([Rev. 15:3](#), RSV).

Index

A

Adventists, Sabbatarian, amplify Millerite judgment explanations, 119, 131

Andrews, John N., 1853 Sanctuary article, 60–70

Antiochus IV Epiphanes, 1, 3–4

Arguments, against Sanctuary doctrine. See **Challenges, critical**

Atonement, began after Christ's ascension (Crosier), 34

concept of, explanation of, 169–170

Miller's use of term, 159–170

views on, mixed, 98, 102–103

work of priest only, 2–3, 13

Atonement, Day of, typical, time of Christ's return, 2, 126–127

forgiveness during, 67–68

not finished, extends to close of millennium (Crosier), 27, 29–30

Snow, Samuel S., on, 13–14

Speculations on, Millerite, answered, 82–85

views on, nineteenth century pre-Millerite, 1–2

Azazel (proper name), 54–55

B

Ballenger, Albion Fox, 199–203

Barnhouse, Donald G., 210–211

Bates, Joseph, contributions to Sanctuary doctrine, 33, 42, 47–50, 131, 136–144

Blotting out of sins, distinguished from forgiveness (Crosier), 31–35

Christ's work, Most Holy Place, 31–32

Breastplate, of judgment, 42, 47, 105, 127, 133, 146

Bridegroom, theme of, 17–18, 21–26, 128–130

divided Millerites, 25–26

Ellen White on, 25, 106–107

C

Canright, Dudley, N., 198–199

Challenges, critical, to Sanctuary doctrine, inside church, 198–209, 217–224

Millerite, 53–59, 68–80, 82–85, 92–94, 96–97

outside church, 209–213

response to, SDA, 213–216

Conradi, Louis R., 205–208

Crosier, Owen R. L., 27, 29–41, 132–133, 134–135

original positions, eventually given up, 198

Cross, viewed as sacrifice only (Miller), 2–3, 159–170

D

Daniel 8:14, nineteenth century interpretation of, 1–16

Daniel 8–9, relationship, crucial to Sanctuary doctrine, 60–62, 71–73

Disappointment, the Great, effect on Millerites, 20–21, 127

Doors, shut/open, 37, 49–53, 98–102

Douty, Norman F., 211–212

E

Edson, Hiram, 21–22, 41, 132

Everts, Elon, coins expression "investigative judgment," 88, 147

F

Fletcher, William W., 203–205

Ford, Desmond, 217–224

Hale, Apollos, 10, 20, 22–24, 27–28, 128, 156–157

Hebrews 9:8, Andrews explains, 75–76

Hoekema, Anthony H., 212–213

“Holiest, into the,” Andrews explains, 69–70

Horn, little (Dan 8), identification of, 1, 3–5, 62–63

H

Jacobs, Enoch, 22, 127–128

Jones, E. B., 208–209

Judgment, began October 22 (according to some Millerites), 127–128, 129

first angel’s message, linked to, 85–87

James White on, 89–91, 144–152

Laodicean message and, 87–89

phases of, 11, 42, 47–48, 121

precedes Second Advent (Litch), 126

prior first resurrection, 87

sanctuary and, 85–92

Second Advent, for most Christians, 120, 125, 154

wedding garment parable, applied to, 23, 92, 122, 128, 138–139

J

Karaite, reckoning by, 2, 14

K

Laodicea, message of, tied to preadvent judgment, 87–89, 149–150

“Law of Moses,” article by Crosier, 29–41, 132–136

Litch, Josiah, links Christ’s priesthood to the church, 10

ties “anointing of Most Holy” (Dan 9) to consecration of Heaven for Christ’s ministry 10–11

two phases of final judgment, 2, 11, 119, 126, 153

L

Martin, Walter R., 209–210

Message, Laodcean, and the judgment, 87–89

Miller, William, accepts Bridegroom theme for a time, 24

believes judgment began October 22 at first, 128–129, 155

historicism interpreter, 2, 6–7

interprets sanctuary (Dan 8:14) as church and earth, 8–10

Ministry, priestly, Christ’s two-phased, 26–27, 31–35

ignorance of, among Christians, 112–113

Most Holy Place, 105–107

Most Holy Place, Andrews on, 73, 76–78

anointing of, 11, 69

heaven/place of Christ’s ministry, general view of, 53

M

Nichols, Otis, 26, 135–136

N

Opposition, to Sanctuary doctrine. See [Challenges, critical](#)

O

Peavey, G. W., 28–29

Preterism, 1

P

Revelation, book of, and heavenly sanctuary, 110–112

“Right hand of God,” expression, Andrews on, 69

James White on, 53

R

Sanctuary, apartments of, 32–34, 42, 65–66
 cleansing of, 27–29, 31, 35, 73–74, 96–97, 106, 138
 covenants and, 30–31, 63–65
 Consensus, statement on (1980), 225–233
 contrasts, Sabbatarian views on, with Millerites, 53–55
 Decalogue and, 42, 44–46, 107
 defilement of, two kinds, 38–41
 development of, doctrine, summary statement, 113–117
 doctrine of, implications of, 123–125
 identity of (Dan 8:14), heavenly, 26, 63–65
 judgment, final, and, 46–48, 85–92
 began in 1844, 86
 first angel's message announces, 85–87
 prior to first resurrection, 86
 opposition to. See *Challenges, critical*
 reality of, heavenly, 42, 43–44, 74, 104–105
 relate to forgiveness of sin and blotting out of sin respectively, 31–32
 Sabbath and, 42, 44–46, 107
 salvation and, 49–53, 68, 108–110
 sealing message and, 48–49
 textual support for, 121–123
 third angel's message, linked to, 107–108
 transferal of sin and guilt, 67–68
 two-phased ministry, 26–27, 104–107
 Sanctuary, in book of Revelation, 110–112
 in *Daniel 8:14*, general nineteenth century understanding of, 1–6
 affected by interpretation of "little horn" (Dan 8), 3
 early linked to Second Advent, 5–6
 Millerite understanding of, 2–3, 6–16
 contrast with Sabbatarian views of, 53–55
 post-Disappointment explanation of, by some Millerites, 17, 21–29, 127–131
 Sabbatarians on, amplify post-Disappointment Millerite explanations, 131
 Scapegoat, symbol of Satan, 35, 54–55, 94–96
 Seventh-month movement, 2, 14–16
 Seventy-weeks, relationship to 2300 days, Andrews on, 60–62, 71–73
 Shut door views, 37, 49–53, 98–102
 Sin/guilt, transferal of (type/antitype), 67–68
 Snow, Samuel S., 2, 13–16, 126–127, 130
 Statement, Consensus (1980), 225–233

Ten virgins, parable of, Bridegroom theme explains Disappointment, 20–26
 viewed as prophecy, 14–16
 Third angel's message, linked to sanctuary doctrine, 107–108
 Turner, Joseph, 22–24, 128–130
 Twenty-three hundred days, literal according to Preterism, 1, 3
 symbolic of literal years, according to historicism, 1
 relationship to the 70 weeks, Andrews explains, 71–73
 Types, spring/fall, 2, 12–14

White, Ellen G. (Harmon), Bridegroom theme, 25
 1858 vision (sanctuary portion), 103–110
 four early visions, 133–134
 relationship to development of sanctuary doctrine, 152–154
 use of Scripture, to explain, 171–196
 White, James, on investigative judgment, 89–91, 144–152
 "Within the veil" expression, Crosier on, 54